NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCVII.

OCTOBER, 1890.

A WORD AS TO THE SPEAKERSHIP.

BY JAMES BRYCE, M. P., AUTHOR OF "THE AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH."

THE editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has asked me to take some part in the interesting controversy which has been carried on in several recent numbers of THE REVIEW upon the functions of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, upon the action of the present Speaker in counting members present, but not voting, for the purposes of a quorum, and upon certain changes that have been recently made in the rules of the House. This is an undertaking which I must respectfully decline, not merely because it involves matters of party dispute in the United States, wherewith a stranger ought not to intermeddle, but also because it raises fine points of constitutional law on which it would be presumptuous for a stranger to pronounce an opinion. All I can attempt is to state some considerations regarding the nature of the Speaker's office and the best modes of dealing with obstruction, or, as it is called in America, "filibustering," which are suggested by the recent experience of the British Parliament; a body in which questions of this kind have been largely canvassed during the last ten years, and in which experiments full of interest for Americans as well as Englishmen have been tried.

The conduct of government by assemblies of men instead of by individual men is proverbially one of the most difficult things in the world. When the number of an assembly rises beyond thirty or forty, so that conversation is superseded by speech-making, the difficulty increases in proportion. When the number passes one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hundred and fifty or two hundred, a new element of trouble is introduced in the excitement produced by the sympathy of a multitude, under whose influence men will say and do things which the judgment of a single man or a small group would at once condemn. Legislation is government: a great deal of legislation in the British Parliament and a good deal even in Congress are scarcely distinguishable from executive government. To be efficient, a governing assembly must be able to economize its time. It must be able to reach a prompt decision and a clear decision—a decision which represents not a mixture of several discordant views, but that one self-consistent view which seems the best of all that have been suggested. There must, therefore, be some method of enabling an assembly to act promptly and vigorously—that is to say, of ascertaining its collective will and giving effect thereto. It was long ago perceived that the only way of determining and using the will of an assembly, in which there may be as many opinions and wills as there are individuals, is to take the will of the majority as being the will of the whole. The majority may be wrong, but presumably it is more likely to be right than the minority, and it, at any rate, represents a presumably physically-stronger mass of men. The majority, therefore, is treated as if it were the whole assembly. Its will is the assembly's will; and it becomes entitled to use all the means necessary to make its will effective by reaching prompt and clear decisions.

Nevertheless, a divided assembly cannot be treated as a unanimous assembly. The fact that there is a minority which entertains a different opinion has material consequences, and calls for some limitation of the powers of the majority. Full and fair discussion of the questions to be decided must be secured, not simply for the sake of the so-called rights of the minority, but in the interests of the whole people whom the assembly represents. It is always possible that discussion may change the views of the majority, convincing some, at least, of them that their first impressions were erroneous, and so shifting the numerical preponderance in the assembly. It is also possible that such discussion may affect opinion in the country at large, and that the time occupied by discussion may enable manifestations of opinion from outside to reach and affect the majority so as to change its views. And even if no change in the assembly results, but the majority persists in its first view, it is clearly desirable that the country

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should perceive that the matter has been duly considered, objections advanced, arguments *pro* and *con* sifted, so that the minority may not go away with a rankling feeling of injustice, and that the law or act which the vote of the assembly has approved may have the better chance of being loyally accepted and obeyed by the people as a whole.

These considerations, of whose importance many illustrations could be given from English and American history, were so much regarded in England that till a very recent period no limit whatever was placed on the duration of Parliamentary debate. Speeches might be of any length, even in Committee of the Whole. Questions might be discussed for any number of hours or days. Amendments might be multiplied to any extent, so long as they did not offend against the rules by raising afresh a question already disposed of. Motions to adjourn the House, or to adjourn a debate, or to report progress when the House was in committee, were always in order. Now and then, when party feeling ran unusually high, as in the debate on the great Reform Bill of 1832, discussion was so intolerably prolonged that it passed into filibustering. But in general the good feeling of men who mostly belonged to the same social class and were in the habit of meeting one another on social occasions, the obedience of the followers to the leaders, the interest which the leaders of an opposition had in checking practices sure to annoy themselves when they in turn came into power, and, above all, the generally-diffused respect for the dignity and authority of the House, combined to prevent abuse of the great latitude which the rules allowed.

Systematic obstruction seems, in recent years, to have been first tried in 1872, when the bill for the abolition of purchase in the British army was pertinaciously, but unsuccessfully, resisted by a group of members in the interest of the officers. In 1877 and the following years it was again resorted to by a section of the members from Ireland, who found in it an effective and not unconstitutional means of calling attention to their contention that the British Parliament was unfitted to deal with Irish questions. Their opposition to the Coercion Bill brought in by Mr. W. E. Forster in 1881 was so persistent and protracted that it had to be overcome partly by the action of the Speaker in interrupting a member while actually speaking, and putting the main question on his own authority,—a proceeding for which there was no prece-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent,—and partly by the passing of some temporary rules called "Rules of Urgency," which were used in the sessions of 1881 and 1882, but have not since been revived. However, in 1882, a new set of regulations was enacted; and among these the power of closure—called in America the "previous question"—was for the first time introduced. It was strenuously resisted by the party who were then in opposition, but when that party found themselves in power in 1887, they were obliged, by the evident impossibility of pushing through business without some means of bringing debate to an end, to enact a code of rules stricter than those of 1882. Under this code, which is that now in force, any member may move "that the question be now put," and "unless it shall appear to the Chair that such motion is an abuse of the rules of the House or an infringement of the rights of the majority," the question shall be put forthwith and decided without debate. It is, however, required that at least one hundred members shall vote in the majority for closure. The Chair has also the power to refuse to put a motion "that the House do adjourn," or "that the chairman do report progress" or leave the chair, if he thinks such motion an abuse of the rules; and he has, further, the power of calling on members who, in his opinion, frivolously or vexatiously claim a division, to rise and be counted in their places. But there is no limitation on the length of speeches or on the number of times the same member may speak in committee.

It will be noticed that under these rules the functions of the Speaker are very important. The rules of 1882 gave to him the right of informing the House if he thought the time for closing a debate had arrived, so that a motion to that effect might then be made. The rules of 1887 allow him to interpose his veto, or, rather, to refuse to put a motion actually made for ending the debate, where he thinks that the necessity for such a motion has not arisen. This provision for the interference of the Speaker is a provision unknown to Congress, and, of course, quite unknown in the earlier history of Parliament. What were the reasons which suggested it?

There was a strong repugnance in the House of Commons to the closure (as we in England call the previous question) pure and simple. We are a conservative people, and shrink from taking long steps if it is possible that short ones may do. Moreover, the ministry who proposed the closure felt that they might before

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long become an opposition, and be silenced by the application of the very "gag," as its enemies called it, which they had just invented. Some safeguard against the abuse of the closure was thought essential. The obvious safeguard, and that which the Tory party had approved in 1882, was to require a proportional majority, say of two-thirds, to pass a closure vote. But to this plan there was the fatal objection that, though it would be effective against a small section of the House, it would be useless against the opposition as a whole, since a party in power can very seldom command a two-thirds' majority. The only alternative, therefore, was to vest in the presiding officer a discretion to protect the minority by refusing to let a closure motion be voted on.

American readers may be surprised to hear that any protection for minorities was expected from the presiding officer. In Congress the Speaker is for many purposes the leader of the majority. The majority is often advised by him, and usually reckons on him to help it to carry out its will. The hare might as well hope that the huntsman would call off the hounds as the minority expect the Speaker to restrain an impatient majority. But in Parliament the Speaker and the chairman of committees (whom for shortness I generally include when I refer to the Speaker) are and have always been non-partisan officials. Each, no doubt, has belonged to a party and has been chosen on the proposition of a party leader. But the Speaker is deemed, once he has assumed the wig and gown of office, to have so distinctly renounced and divested himself of all party trappings that, if he is willing to go on serving in a new Parliament in which the party to which he belonged is in a minority, the majority is, nevertheless, expected to elect him anew. Thus Speaker Brand, although he had once been whip of the Liberal party, was reëlected Speaker in 1874 by the Tory party, which had then gained a majority, and served on till 1883. The Speaker is not permitted, so long as he holds office, to deliver any party speech outside Parliament, or even to express his opinions on any party question; and in the chair itself he must be scrupulously fair to both parties, equally accessible to all members, bound to give his advice on points of order without distinction between those who ask it. It is to this impartiality, which has never been wanting to any Speaker within living memory, that the Speakership owes a great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of the authority it enjoys and the respect it inspires. And for that very reason many prudent statesmen condemned in 1887 the rule which lodged in the Speaker's hands this discretionary power to put or refuse to put a motion for the closure of debate. They argued that such a function imposed too severe a strain upon the Chair, whose action was likely to be condemned by partisans on one side or the other. Things might be said by angry members, comments might be made in the public press which would sap the deference hitherto paid to this exalted office. It was not, however, I must again repeat, intentional partisanship on the part of the Chair that was feared, but occasional errors of judgment which might breed criticism and censure. The traditions of the Speakership have acted so strongly on those who have held the office, and have so permeated the political life of England, that practical politicians believed the Speaker would use his new powers in a fair and impartial spirit.

How, then, have these new powers been, in fact, used, and what has been the result upon the House of Commons of the rules which sanction the closure? This is a question of interest for the Senate of the United States, which has recently been invited to enact a "Previous-Question Rule" for itself. But it is one which cannot as yet be answered adequately, for four sessions are a short time in which to test an institution. At present we have two exceptionally firm and fair-minded men presiding over the House and over Committee of the Whole. Their disposition seemed at first to be to construe very strictly the rule which gave them a veto, and to allow the motion for closure to be voted on unless there was a palpable impropriety in making it; in the view, apparently, that the responsibility of closing the debate belonged to the House itself, and that, if the majority determined to close it, they ought, unless under circumstances so flagrantly unjust as to demand the Chair's interference, to bear the sole responsibility and the consequent approval or censure of public opinion.

It was soon perceived, however, that this was a responsibility which the majority were ready to accept with a very light heart. Majorities are usually impatient and anxious to go home to dinner or to bed. They are very loyal to their leaders when action of a distinctly party nature is to be taken. Under our English practice, moreover, the majority consists largely of per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sons who have been lounging or playing chess in the smoking-room, or writing letters in the library, and who, rushing into the House when the division bells ring, know nothing about what has passed, but vote just as the party whips tell them. Experience, in fact, showed that, whenever a leader of the majority moved the closure, the majority would vote for it, and showed also that the chiefs of the majority cannot be trusted to move it only on proper occasions. The present leader is a diligent and kindly man, who (as he has often declared) desires to do his duty to his Queen and his country—nothing more and nothing less. Yet even he, and his lieutenants much more frequently than he, repeatedly err in demanding the stoppage of debate when discussion is proceeding in a legitimate way, and members well entitled to be heard desire to speak. The most sensible and best-intentioned ministers must sometimes commit such errors, for their great anxiety is to press on their own business, and they forget that, even assuming proposals to be substantially good, the House and the country are entitled to satisfy themselves by ample debate that such is the fact. Accordingly the Chair has latterly tended to take a somewhat wider view of its own functions in the matter, and has frequently refused to put a closure motion even when the leader of the majority claimed to have it put, declaring that, as it was not clear that the main question had been fully discussed, debate ought to be suffered to proceed.

Thus the closure, though now more frequently applied than was intended when it was introduced in 1882, has curtailed the freedom of debate less than might have been expected. This, however (I must repeat), has been due, not to any scruples on the part of the majority, but to the action of the chair, which has protected the minority in a way that has more than once irritated the hotter spirits among the rank and file of the majority. Let it, however, be remembered that we in England have had an experience of three and a half years only. Those who occupy the chair in future may be less scrupulously fair than Mr. Peel and Mr. Courtney have shown themselves. The majorities of the future, perceiving how much a biassed Speaker can aid them, may resolve to choose men of less impartial mind; and the result of giving to the Speaker these great political powers—for political they are—may be ultimately to alter the conception

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and character of the Speakership itself and turn it into a partisan office.

It cannot be doubted that, if the control now exercised by the Chair were withdrawn, the closing power would be constantly and recklessly used. A majority is the least scrupulous thing imaginable, because everybody puts his conscience into the keeping of his party, and the party justifies its conduct, sometimes by supposed zeal for the public interest, always by its corporate spirit. Nothing restrains it but the fear of public opinion. And English experience, so far as it has yet gone, shows that the fear of public opinion is, in ordinary cases, only a feeble protection. The country does not, even with our comparatively full newspaper reports of the proceedings of Parliament, realize what passes there. It does not know when obstruction is being practised, and apparently does not much care; for each party habitually accuses its opponents of obstruction. So, too, the country does not seem to resent the application of the closure, unless an instance of oppression arises so patent and glaring that it can be made clear to the meanest understanding. Probably, therefore, unless the interposition of an impartial Chair continues to govern the development of our Parliamentary habits, the closure will come in time to be as frequently employed at Westminster as at Washington. The minority, when they are now silenced by it, console themselves with the thought that their turn will come. "We are chastised with whips, but when we are the majority, we will chastise them with scorpions." The minority in the next Parliament will, when they suffer, comfort themselves in like manner. As in the civil wars of the Roman republic, each faction, when it came into power, took a more ferocious revenge upon its enemies than those enemies had taken upon it before, so the tyranny of a majority in the legislature is likely to become more and more pronounced on every change of power from party to party.*

*I have not referred in these remarks to the most dangerous form which an application of the power of closing debate takes viz., that of fixing a day and hour at which all discussion of a particular bill shall cease, and after which no amendment can be voted on, but the bill shall be passed or rejected as a whole, because this form is entirely independent of the action of the Chair, being prescribed by the vote of the majority only. It has twice been resorted to in the present Parliament; whether wisely or not I do not now inquire. On both occasions it has excited the strongest resentment and been recognized to be a weapon liable to grave abuse on the part of a tyrannical majority.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A few words only are needed as to the other powers over debate which the new rules give to the Speaker in England. The power of refusing to put a dilatory motion because, in the opinion of the Chair, it is an abuse of the rules of the House, has been seldom resorted to, because its mere existence has done much to check these motions when they are frivolous or vexatious. It has proved a valuable power, and not least so because the Chair, by refusing to use it when the majority desired to see it used, has indirectly intimated the opinion that a protracted discussion which the majority disliked was in fact legitimate. More than once during the session of 1890 things would have taken a quite different turn if the Chair had used this power in the way the majority desired. The right of requiring members to rise in their places and be counted, instead of going through the division lobbies,—a process which consumes from eight to fifteen minutes,—has been still less frequently employed; but the fact that it exists has tended to check purely frivolous divisions, and no complaint (so far as I know) has been heard of any mistakes made by the Chair in applying either these rules or that under which a member indulging in tedious, repetitious, or irrelevant remarks may be directed to resume his seat.

The conclusions which may be fairly deduced from the history of Parliamentary procedure in England during the last ten years seem to be the following :

That some power of terminating debate by closure, or previous question, had become absolutely necessary.

That a majority is certain to abuse this power—*i. e.*, to use it where it is not absolutely required, and where its use is not only oppressive, but prejudicial to the public interest.

That the veto of the Chair has tended to check such abuse and has given frequent protection to the minority.

That the conduct of the Chair, whether or not it has been always right, has been invariably impartial, so far as intentions went, and that its reputation has not hitherto suffered.

That it is, nevertheless, possible that English ministers and majorities may in the future desire to have a partisan in the chair, seeing how helpful he may be to them, and that the traditional character of the Speakership is, therefore, not exempt from danger.

On the whole, therefore, we in England are not disposed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

retrace the steps we have taken. The House of Commons could not get on without a closure. But the incidental evils are real evils, and we look with some anxiety to the future.

Let me now attempt, before closing this paper, to apply what has been said regarding the House of Commons to the questions of Congressional procedure which have been fought over in the pages of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

There are three conspicuous differences between the position and practice of either house of Congress and that of either house of Parliament.

The House of Representatives is not supreme over its own procedure. It is subject to the Constitution, which has absolutely secured to a minority of one-fifth of a quorum the right to have the names of the yeas and nays on a division entered on the journal—a right which not only tends, but invites, to filibustering. The House of Commons, on the other hand, can take its divisions in any way it pleases, recording the names or not. Owing to its method of making the Ayes and Noes walk through different lobbies, it takes its divisions in less than half the time occupied by the calling of the roll in the House of Representatives, although the number of members in the House of Commons is more than double that of the House of Representatives. Moreover, the Constitution of the United States expressly confers upon the House certain powers which there is nothing in English law to prevent the House of Commons from delegating, if it pleases, to the Speaker. That the House of Representatives cannot delegate these powers has been powerfully argued by Speaker Reed in the pages of this REVIEW. Thus the House of Commons is in several respects far more completely master of the situation than its trans-Atlantic compeer.

In the United States long habit has made the Speaker a recognized partisan—a partisan limited, no doubt, by usage and good feeling, but still understood to be entitled to use his power in the interest of his party. In the House of Commons he is expected to be absolutely impartial. Consequently many powers may be intrusted to an English Speaker, whose equity and fairness are above suspicion, which it might in America be unsafe to commit to one who is virtually, however personally honest, a party chieftain.

In both Houses of Congress another long habit has established the right of members to be physically present during a division

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and yet to abstain from voting. In both Houses of Parliament every member present has always been held bound to vote, and recusant members have more than once been positively compelled to vote. The only resource of a person who seeks to escape this duty is to hurry out of the House before the two minutes allowed for members to come in have elapsed and the doors have been locked. I do not know whether the American habit of permitting members to have each his own desk, where he can read and write, has anything to do with this permission to remain a silent spectator of a division. To us Englishmen both the desks and the habit of non-participation while physically present, as well as the right to change one's vote while the division proceeds, seem unfortunate; and we are not surprised that technical difficulties should arise out of the regulations for a quorum where the anomaly exists of divisions of the House which are not divisions of the whole body of members present. Such a question as that which Speaker Reed decided, and his decision on which has been embodied in the rule since enacted by the House, could not have arisen at Westminster, where we know of only one quorum—the quorum consisting of every member within the four walls of the chamber whom the eye of the Speaker sees and his finger (or, rather, the cocked hat he points with) and voice count audibly when a count is required.

If an English member were asked to give his *primâ facie* impression on the point, he would probably answer that the view which recognized those who were physically present as being also legally present commended itself to his common-sense. The ingenious argument of X M. C. would puzzle him. But he would say that, technicalities apart, there seems something absurd in attributing more effect to the action of those who seek by abstaining from voting to defeat the passage of a motion than to that of the same persons voting against the motion. To abstain seems less than to oppose. Yet under the method of resistance which Speaker Reed defeated it would have counted for more.

As regards the power now conferred on the Speaker of the House of Representatives to refuse to put a dilatory motion which he deems frivolous or obstructive, I have already remarked that it has been recently given to the English Speaker and used with results generally admitted (up to the date of this writing) to be excellent. Whether it would be equally safe in the hands of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Speaker at Washington is a point on which a stranger must not express an opinion, though he may remark that the bestowal of it on the Speaker in England would have been resisted but for the confidence felt in the superiority of that officer to party bias. There are cases which imply dilatory tactics, as, for instance, where a measure is being pressed through before the country has had time to understand it and express its opinion regarding it. In such cases the indulgence which a wise chairman will extend to dilatory motions may be serviceable. I do not, however, deny that times may be imagined in which the power in question might have to be intrusted even to a partisan Chair. A governing assembly cannot suffer itself to be paralyzed; it must, at whatever risk to minorities, find some method of despatching its business. In England, where everything depends on the action of Parliament, this first duty of self-preservation is, perhaps, more imperative than in the United States. In England, on the other hand, the harm that may follow a rash and violent exercise of the force of a Parliamentary majority is greater than in the United States, because the House of Commons is not restrained, like the House of Representatives, by other constitutional authorities. The House of Lords can, no doubt, resist the Commons, and does so when the Liberal party commands a majority in the latter body. But the House of Lords will not stand long as it stands now; and when the inevitable struggle between it and the Lower House has been fought out, its submission, or perhaps its virtual extinction, will leave the fortunes of the nation at the mercy of the majority in a single popular assembly. These questions of procedure, therefore, and the maintenance of the dignity of an impartial Chair, on which the conduct of procedure now more than ever depends, are questions of even more vital significance to Britain than they are to the United States.

There is another question to which Speaker Reed has adverted in his interesting article in the July number of this REVIEW, on which a few words may be said, because British experience is in point. It is the question of saving the time of Congress by referring the decision of contested elections to a judicial tribunal instead of to a Committee of the House. I have already had occasion to observe that, where long traditions and deep-rooted habits have attached the character of impartiality to an office, functions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which in other hands might be dangerous may (for a time at least) be safely intrusted to the holder of that office. Nothing rouses more party feeling in England, as well as in America, than a contested election. No class of cases had given so much trouble to Parliamentary committees and caused so much scandal as cases of elections petitioned against on grounds of bribery or treating or intimidation. The decisions of these committees inspired little confidence, for they were usually colored by party feeling; the procedure was costly and tedious; the rules of evidence were often laxly applied. It was at last proposed to take the trial of such election petitions out of the hand of Parliamentary committees and intrust it to the judges of the Superior Courts of Common Law. Many constitutional authorities doubted the wisdom of this proposal, predicting that the result would be to drag the judges into the political arena, to expose them to imputations of unfairness, to injure the standing and credit of the Bench as a whole. The judges themselves protested strongly. Parliament, however, persisted in the teeth of their protest, and since 1868 all election cases have been tried by judges at the spot where the election took place, points of law being reserved for the decision of the courts in London. The general elections of 1868 and 1874 produced a whole crop of petitions. Here and there a judge was supposed to have dealt somewhat too leniently with a political friend or with an eminent politician, whether or no of the same party as himself. But, speaking generally, the fairness of the judges, who, be it remembered, sat as judges of fact without a jury, was conspicuous, and very few of their decisions failed to command public approval. The experiment was so evidently a success that no one has subsequently proposed to revert to the former method of trial.

Since 1874 very few election petitions have been presented, so that the matter has almost passed out of the knowledge or attention of the public. But our experience in 1868 and 1874 was certainly such as to recommend the plan for at least a provisional adoption in America, assuming that the constitutional obstacles do not prove insuperable. It may, however, be doubted whether it would be prudent to set Federal district judges to try election cases arising in their own respective districts. English experience showed the advantage of having a tribunal en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tirely exempt from local influences; and similar considerations might be expected to apply in the United States, where the ties of party loyalty generally, and of local party feeling in particular, are probably stronger than they were in England in 1868. A judge wholly unconnected with the locality would seem better fitted for the duty than one habitually resident in the district. The substitution of judges for Parliamentary committees has, by making trials speedier and detection more certain, become one of the expedients, along with more stringent penalties, with a secret ballot, and with the enlargement of constituencies, whereby we have so dealt with bribery and intimidation that these old scandals of representative government have almost ceased to exist among us.

JAMES BRYCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THOSE AMERICAN GIRLS IN EUROPE.

BY MADAME ADAM.

I HAVE just read in the June number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW the very interesting article of my witty confrère, Mrs. John Sherwood, and I ask myself, as I am already asked by the editor of the incomparable REVIEW for which I write these lines, if there is not, after the American view, something to be said from the European stand-point on the young American girl in Europe.

The perspective being reversed, the picture which I shall attempt to paint will have, if not a different tone, at least different shades.

I know America only by its history, by its literature, by the important facts of its daily life. I have never seen its wonderful cities, which a quarter of a century suffices to build; which rise to the rank of capitals in as little time as it takes to rebuild a few houses in our old towns. I have never had the vertigo which must seize one on seeing man oscillate daily in action, in motion similar to the ebb and flood of the great ocean that bathes the shores of the new world. I can only suspect the interest that attractive world would have for me, where so many races mingle, where the adaptation of the individual to the surroundings produces a sum of human power such as has never been attained elsewhere, and can never be surpassed.

When I think of the United States, and realize that I am ignorant of the peculiarities to be observed on penetrating more deeply into anything, I naturally proceed to take a general view. I see a nation, manly, daring, audacious, valiant, whose people command success wherever they pursue it, whose citizens despise weakness of whatever sort it may be, and scorn danger—death itself—with a heroism so simple as to appear unconscious. My

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vision of such a people is severe, sombre, even for a Parisian; this mass incessantly waging war with everything that may be overcome is disturbing.

But in the midst of these austere struggles for life, a luminous and smiling figure detaches itself. She is beautiful with perfect beauty, or endowed with a triumphal grace. It seems that all this rude civilization becomes gentle for her alone. The young girl is the aristocracy, the luxury, the art, the crown of American society, as the Epicurean was of ancient society. She alone enjoys and profits by her leisure. It is for her that man bends with such fury beneath the weight of labor for his betrothed or his daughter.

At home the young American girl is at the same time the tyrant and the reward. She pushes aside her brothers, she domineers over her mother, but she is the smile and joy of her father: it is she who animates the household, who lights it up, makes it rejoice; the only gay echoes are those of her voice or the voices of her companions.

It is only when his daughter is bored, or when she wishes an aristocratic marriage, that the American head of the family makes up his mind to leave his absorbing and intoxicating business for a few months and take her to Europe.

You know the conservatories of orchids—that flower of richness among all flowers? It needs more heat and light than any other. It is a curious flower which blooms in a way that surprises you incessantly. Beautiful, dazzling, it first charms you by its strangeness, and then intoxicates you with its subtile perfume. It lives on air and needs none of the material conditions of existence for other plants: it often comes from a gnarled stem which seems to defy beauty; yet from this stem it blossoms frequently with singular, but always incomparable, attractiveness.

The young American girl is the orchid among all feminine flowers; and it is far from her to the humble violet to which the young French maiden has until recently been compared.

I have said until recently, for our humble, timid, and blushing young girl is now hardly to be found outside of small provincial towns. The young American girl has an enormous influence on the young French girl. Wherever they meet, the timid one becomes modified. The young English girls with their boyish ways, their lack of elegance, their manner of walking—the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

few conquests they had made in France had in no way modified the ways of our daughters. They were laughed at, and no one thought of copying them. But with the American it was another thing: she is enviable and too often irresistible; she must therefore be imitated from afar in all that is seductive,—her sincerity, her spontaneousness, her life,—while the delicate charm of French education is retained.

Certainly our daughters cannot pretend to reign in France and in Europe as the young girls reign in America. There they are queens, and sometimes more, though it is very hard to apply to such bewitching persons the words "merciless tyrants." They rule in the family, and the family does not rule them; they rule in the society which gravitates around their pleasures, whose laws, customs, and liberties have for them exclusive protections, indulgences, and favors. And all this they noisily enjoy with the same ardor displayed by their fathers in the pursuit of wealth.

The great charm of the American girl in Europe is that she combines at once the purity of the young girl and the coquetry of the young married woman. Thus in the old world she is certain of attracting all the young men who have abused life, who are a little *blasé*, and who to be captivated have need of what they call *du montant*.

When an American girl enters a ball-room or a large reception in Europe, the spectacle is a curious one for the observer. A sort of current is formed among the mass of guests, and one may judge of the character of each one from his attitude and manner towards her. Let us attempt to paint the scene. Miss —— makes her appearance. She is always beautiful, and even were she not, she possesses originality and *éclat*—for the latter word describes her entirely. A young French girl, simple, well-educated, throws around her a soft light which permits her to be observed, judged, and examined. The young American girl has something flashing. She flits rather than walks; from the moment of her entrance into a drawing-room she is surrounded by a bevy of admirers, and her pretty head is always in motion. No one can see the details of her features, which are so mobile, nor the lines of her mouth, which has so many diverse expressions. Her glances are like diamonds whose many facets cause our eyes to blink beneath their lustre. Her hair is lightly and negligently knotted, curly, and not arranged according to good form, giving her the *air chiffonné*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the pretty girl who may be admitted in the ball-room, but not during the ball.

Miss —— is arrayed in a rather loud, though tasteful, gown, fitting to perfection. Disdaining none of the artifices of dress, she walks well, and her figure, her carriage, her swaggering, suit her to perfection. The young men who flit around the coquettish young married women rush to meet the American, surround her, press her hand if they know her, or have themselves introduced. She is at her ease with all; this pack of admirers and of observers does not trouble her; she answers them all, talks and laughs loudly, dominates them all, and, if she has made a choice, parades it with a boldness which sometimes embarrasses even a Lovelace.

The young married women complain of the impertinence of the young men of their day to old gentlemen who, a while ago, would not have found room by their side; the mothers treat the conqueror as an enemy who may upset their pet projects; the young girls join together and sit closely, like a flock of birds at the approach of a hawk. They are irritated by the tone, the manners, of the young men towards the American. Our young girls, until they see their brothers and lovers with Miss ——, know them only as perfectly proper, sentimental if they wish to be agreeable, and attempting to charm by gentleness. They see them as they are elsewhere, scoffing, sceptical, appearing to rush to an attack; talking cosmopolitan slang and displaying the manners of travellers in a casino. Then our daughters are shocked and scandalized, but their blame does not blind them; they see the risk they are running.

The young American girl in France, even though she should reside there a long time, still remains a peculiar being, disturbing the men and a source of uneasiness to the women. Once married, she immediately lays aside her eccentricities. There are no young American married women—that is to say, nothing in the manner of an American who has become Madame distinguishes her from another Madame.

The young French girl finds liberty in marriage; the young American girl loses it. Our daughters detach themselves from a family in marrying; the Americans enter one: they are suddenly surrounded by a circle, by proprieties, by worldly customs, by social duties, by the exigencies of conjugal fidelity, by the duty of defending a reputation which has become common

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

property—all serious things which transform their character, their manner of being, and gradually model them after the likeness of their surroundings. Two or three years after her marriage the American in France is a women of the world, and if she could lose her accent, nothing would distinguish her from her new circle.

Doubtless formerly she commanded and was obeyed ; but how far she was from occupying the position which she occupies in France ! True, she did not yield to respect ; but in return she did not inspire it. She had more personal initiative, but she did not govern others ; she tormented her mother, and perhaps led her, but the men of her family did not deferentially ask her counsels. Her husband in America would seek her advice for nothing. She might be a favored companion in conjugal life ; she would not be, as in France, the wife, the friend who shares all the projects of the husband, is associated in all his acts, and makes of conjugal life the noble life in common.

And her children—how they are much more her own ; how she rules their education ; how much longer they belong to her ! It is when married, in France, that she is best assimilated to her surroundings, and it is then that with us she is most happy. However, Franco-American marriages are rare, because the French families are uneasy and afraid of them. In England the young American girls come in much larger numbers, not because they are drawn thither by any affinity of race, for there is often less analogy of character between two sisters than between two strangers, but because, English girls having more liberty than French, a first resistance is already overcome ; the marriageable men do not perform such an eccentric act in introducing into their families as a fiancée a young miss accustomed to independence. Therefore the American girl married in England remains more American than in France. She has to make no efforts to lead her mother-in-law, sisters-in-law, and cousins by marriage to accept her ways, her habits contracted in girlhood. Fault may be found with her education, but the method of this education will not be discussed. Not having to become otherwise, she remains herself, yielding only to what she accepts in English society or to that which she finds advantageous to her position or her person.

In Italy, in Rome, in Florence, in Venice, she remains unchanged. The one who marries her accepts her with all her ways ;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she imposes these, almost colonizes them in her circle. Everything is *à l'Americaine*—the mode of living, of keeping house, the immoderate luxury, the tone, the bearing. Italian society, having become cosmopolitan, accepts her as she is, and even at court the place given her is more American than Italian.

In Austria young American girls marry but little; the sixteen quarterings necessary to obtain favor at court cannot be bought with dollars, however numerous these may be.

At Nice, at Cannes, the young American girl merely passes. She lives with her fellow-countrymen and only mingles in the cosmopolitan society to rule it as she rules in America; it is she who gives the tone to the entertainments, who monopolizes the amusements, who lays down the law as in New York or in the capital of some State in the new world.

The young French girl who has lived at Cannes or at Nice may be known by a little American air that she has. She rides more boldly on horseback and converses in a different way with the young men in a ball-room; in short, she has a certain dash which she would never have if she did not copy the Americans.

That which is striking in American girls, and which induces French, English, and Italian noblemen to marry them, is that they never look like shopkeepers' daughters; they sometimes have unbearable, shocking ways, but they are never vulgar. They may be charged with what we call in France *airs de cocodettes*, but not one of them looks like a tradeswoman, though they are mostly the daughters of manufacturers.

The American girl has the science of pleasing which captivates even the old-world Don Juans unawares. She seems to us exceptionally intelligent, putting forth all her talents to attain the final end, which is trapping, often for his own good, a titled husband.

What the European women denounce in the young Americans is the abuse of flirtation in which some of them indulge. At this dangerous pastime they learn to overexcite the vanity of the men, and therefore disdain them.

At Cannes, thirty years ago, I met Miss M., the first American I ever knew. Very beautiful, dark, with blue eyes, she excited admiration not only by her beauty, but by her wit; but all that was sentimental made her smile: loyal and frank, she conceived only the idea of duty, but in the proportion she herself had determined.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I found her ferocious. Her mother, with whom Miss M. was at Cannes, was ill of ennui, and the girl had a grudge against her for not enjoying life on its practical sides as she did herself. The poor woman, daughter of a French emigrant, had the daughter I describe and two sons, whom she never saw, who never wrote to her, whom she worshipped, and whom she could reproach for nothing save their indifference. Her husband, who was very wealthy, retained his passion for business and was so absorbed by it that he sometimes spent eight nights—she never saw him during the day—without speaking to her. He had allowed her to leave without showing any emotion. Miss M. found her father perfect and her mother absolutely unreasonable with her sentimental exigencies.

"Never," repeated the young girl, "never has he refused anything to my mother or to me. What more can we wish?"

"But a little tenderness, affection," answered the mother. "I am dying of the heartlessness shown by all of you, and my husband surely owes me something in return for what I feel for him."

Miss M. shrugged her shoulders.

"But," said I to her one day, "what idea have you of marriage? Whom do you think of marrying?"

"I do not like the ways of the American men," she replied; "they are too rough. However, I could never marry a European; his ways are too gentle; he talks nonsense; he warbles; he is deceitful; he listens to his own speeches. Then his greatest defect is too great a love of money for his own enjoyment; he is a hunter who willingly eats all his game. The American gives money to spend to his family; he hardly longs or wishes for any. Hence," she coldly added, "man is an animal thrown by woman on society, and must bring something in return."

The American girl must be rich, for she has an insatiable desire to spend. Therefore she must have wealth even to be married by a rich man. Many poor young men would marry Americans for their beauty, for their charms, if their needs and exigencies did not frighten them. Poverty in Europe is scorned and cannot be imposed upon a woman who would rush headlong to it with a small fortune.

Young American girls who are not wealthy are, therefore, rarely married, and cannot be, for they have more need of money than any European girl; but they are *folles de qualité*, as was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said in the last century, and from the fondness they have for people of rank they desire also position in society. All these ambitions necessitate wealth. Therefore, what can a rich American desire, if not the only thing not be bought in the American market and which can only be negotiated in the European—an open or closed coronet?

"Money in the old world has a value different from that in the new," said a young American girl to me. "With us it rolls without amassing pleasure, without deriving any benefit from the past. In Europe it can make a great lady in a day; it is exchanged for real, durable, and renewed satisfactions. In America it serves only for a profitless struggle for luxury, spread before the eyes of people who disperse, with whom we do not spend our life, who are dropped by the wayside, who do not even turn to speak a word of thanks, and who rarely remember."

I have spoken only of the young American girls who come to Europe to try to settle there; but how many have I seen of those fair neighbors who come to suck certain flowers of our civilization, to make from them American honey! These become every year more artistic, more learned, more enlightened; they soar always higher in their flight; the horizon expands before them; and they prepare for the new world a pleiad of superior women.

JULIETTE ADAM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE.

BY M. ROMERO, MEXICAN MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES.

II.

THE United States delegates viewed the election of Mr. Blaine as an act of deference and courtesy to themselves, and decided to reciprocate it by offering their support in carrying out any plan the Latin-American delegates might accept for the appointment of one or more vice-presidents. With the best intention of pleasing their colleagues, and following the parliamentary practices which prevail in this country, the United States delegates made a suggestion, which did not find favor, to the effect that, there being three different sections of America represented in the Conference, a vice-president should be elected for each of them—to wit, one from the delegates of Central America, two from the delegates of South America (one representing the eastern side, or the nations bordering on the Atlantic, and the other the western side, or the nations bordering on the Pacific), and a fourth to represent the Latin portion of North America.

Although I do not believe that any of the delegates desired to be elected vice-president on personal grounds, the matter was looked upon with a great deal of interest by all of them, on account of the political bearing which it might have on the relations between their respective countries. The above suggestion was not accepted, owing to the difficulty of coming to an agreement about the appointment of one or more vice-presidents; and it was decided that none should be elected, but that in the absence of the president his place should be filled by each delegate in turn as designated by lot.

The question of the precedence of the nations represented in the Conference was next brought up. Some thought that the alphabetical order should be adopted, and others that this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matter also should be decided by lot. The latter plan prevailed, and in the third meeting of the Conference all the nations represented were placed in ballot, and thus the precedence given to their delegates was decided. This arrangement would very likely have lasted during the remaining sessions of the Conference had the president been a man of fewer engagements than the Secretary of State, and one who would have been able to attend all the meetings and remain as long as they lasted; but, this not being so, it was found, soon afterwards, that the change of the presiding officer every day created many difficulties, because there was no uniformity in the decisions of the chair; and this caused delay and inconvenience in the workings of the Conference. For this reason it was agreed to elect two vice-presidents, who should be called to the chair by turns in the absence of the president, and that in their absence the chair should be filled by the other delegates in regular order. In compliance with this agreement, on December 6 a ballot was taken for first vice-president. There being no majority in favor of any of the candidates, very likely on account of the differing political tendencies of the South American states, the vote was adjourned to the following day, when it resulted in a tie, the delegate from Peru having obtained eight votes and a delegate from Mexico eight also. As Mexico had two delegates, the second intended to vote for his colleague, not as an honor to him personally, but to their country, which course would have been perfectly proper; but he was induced by his colleague to give up this purpose, and the election was decided by lot, the Peruvian delegate drawing the first vice-presidency and a delegate from Mexico the second vice-presidency.

Then occurred an incident, insignificant in itself, but which caused a misunderstanding that I do not think is yet fully dispelled. As the United States delegates were disposed to accept and support anything that their colleagues might determine upon in regard to the vice-presidency, as an act of courtesy towards them and in exchange for their electing as president the Secretary of State, they thought that the Latin-American delegates would be more free to discuss and decide this point, which was a delicate one (being somewhat personal), if they consulted by themselves; and for this reason the United States delegates were not present in the room where their colleagues met.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their absence, however, was considered by some of the Latin-American delegates as an act of discourtesy, because they believed that a want of consideration had induced them not to assemble in the same room, whereas the true reason was a desire to show consideration for their associates.

Another incident which threatened to disturb the good understanding of the Conference was the view entertained by the Argentine delegation that the delegates should only express the official opinion of their governments, and that personal views ought not to be taken into consideration either in the Conference or in the committees. The law providing for the meeting of the Conference had authorized each nation to send as many delegates as it thought proper, but ordered at the same time that each country should have only one vote; so that, whatever might have been the opinions of the delegates from any state, in casting their vote only one opinion was expressed, which was the opinion of the majority, and therefore the official opinion of their government.

It was natural to suppose and to expect that each delegate would express the opinion of his government contained in his instructions, when the case under consideration was embraced in such instructions, or an opinion as nearly as possible in accord with the wishes and interests of his country as each one might form when he had not specific instructions on any particular question. In many cases the American governments either did not give instructions to their delegates or gave them very broad ones, preferring that they should exercise their own personal judgment and discretion on such questions as might arise. To assert, therefore, that the delegates ought to express only the official opinion of their governments was to interfere in a measure with the relations of the delegates to their respective governments, and to limit their right to say what they thought proper. This opinion did not meet with favor in the body, since, while it arrived at no decision on this point, it never refused to hear any personal opinion, or dissenting opinions from two or more members of the same delegation.

The appointment of the committees was a very important matter, since a great deal of the success of the Conference depended thereon, and, with a view to avoiding any unpleasantness among the delegates on this account, they agreed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

request the president to appoint them. Mr. Blaine performed that duty without consulting, as I understand, any of the delegates, only exercising his own discretion on the subject. I do not know that the appointment of the committees gave rise to any well-grounded complaint, or caused embarrassment in the transaction of the business which they had in charge. The only embarassment I have heard of in the committees was caused by the discordant opinions of the delegates from one country who were members of the same committees, and by the fact that the United States delegates did not have instructions from their government, and could therefore express only their own personal views. In the Committee on Monetary Union there were two United States delegates, who held opposite views in regard to the coining of silver, and this made it difficult for the other members of the committee to find out what was the view of the United States government on this subject. I understand there was a similar difficulty, although in a much smaller degree, in the Committee on Communications by Railways; but the most serious troubles arose in the Welfare or Arbitration Committee, because the United States member expressed personal views, and they were not shared by the other members. The peculiarities of the United States delegate, which consisted in his tendency to delay a decision and in trying to have his views prevail over those of the majority of the committee, although he was in every other respect a most estimable gentleman, made the workings of the committees of which he was a member far from easy; more especially so in the Welfare Committee, of which he was the chairman, and which had charge of quite difficult and complicated matters. The troubles in that committee were greater, as I understand, than in any other.

My personal knowledge of what took place in the Conference leads me to think that there was not on the part of Mr. Blaine any preconceived plan about the subjects that were to be considered, except, perhaps, that of arbitration, and that he not only had no prearranged plan, but even refused to express opinions on any subject, or even to give instructions to his delegates when called on for them. Mr. Blaine's purpose, as it appears to me, was not to curtail in any manner whatever the full freedom of all the Latin-American nations represented in the Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ference, and to allow equal freedom to the United States delegates, so that all might propose and agree on such points as they should think most advantageous to the interests of their respective countries, without any pressure and without even suggestions from the United States government. Even in regard to the arbitration plan Mr. Blaine's wish was only that an agreement should be arrived at to the end that all disputes arising among American nations might be ended by arbitration, with the very laudable and humanitarian object of abolishing war; and he did not seem to have any special plan of his own. When he drafted one, he did it with the purpose of uniting the discordant opinions of the delegates, and without intending to press it upon any one. His interference on this subject was only for the purpose of proposing the plan which was accepted by a majority of the Conference; and to carry out this purpose he had to instruct one of the United States delegates to give up his opposition to the form in which the project was finally accepted. It was asserted at the time that even the general idea of arbitration was not unanimously supported by the representatives of the United States.

Arbitration is a very difficult and complicated subject. It cannot be denied that during the last centuries mankind has advanced very rapidly in civilization and moral sense, and it is to be hoped that, before the lapse of a long period, such advancement will make war impossible, for war has been thus far one of the greatest scourges which have afflicted the human race. But as long as the moral sense of civilized countries will not disapprove of war as a savage way of adjusting differences among themselves, not much advancement will be made by accepting arbitration in solemn treaties, especially if no method of coercion is agreed upon against such nations as may refuse to compromise their differences, and such a method cannot be established without attempts against the sovereignty and independence of the respective states.

It was thought by some that the purpose of the United States was to establish a permanent court of arbitration at Washington, and this was looked upon as a way of giving the United States a decided preponderance in all questions affecting this continent. Although I understand that the United States delegate who was chairman of the Committee on Welfare looked favorably upon the idea of having a permanent tribunal, and his views on this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subject were shared by one of his colleagues, the plan was not accepted by the other Latin-American delegates, nor by the Secretary of State of the United States, and had, therefore, to be abandoned.

Mr. Blaine wished arbitration without limitations, which might nullify the principle. Chili did not favor arbitration, except in a very restricted manner. Mexico and the Argentine Republic desired reasonable limitations, while all the other states accepted the idea without any. The Argentine and Brazilian delegates introduced, on January 15, an arbitration project which contained, besides, declarations and stipulations against conquest. This was referred on that date to the Committee on Welfare, and was not reported by that committee until April 10, near the close of the sessions of the Conference, which adjourned on the 19th.

While this project was in committee Mr. Blaine had two meetings with delegates at his residence; the first one with the representatives of Chili, the Argentine Republic, Brazil, and Mexico, whose views were supposed not to be in entire accordance with Mr. Blaine's, although the republican government of Brazil had then authorized its delegates to accept the widest possible plan of arbitration; and the second meeting with all the other delegates, who fully accepted the views of the Secretary of State.

On account of the objections made to the Argentine project, both by Mr. Blaine and by some Spanish-American delegates, the committee, of which the Argentine delegate was the leading spirit, gave the matter the form in which it was finally reported, and it was divided into two parts, one containing all the stipulations in regard to arbitration proper and the other embracing all those relating to conquest

The report of the committee was presented to the Conference so late that it could only be taken up partially in three meetings, and there was not sufficient time to consider it carefully, or even to adopt verbal amendments which were necessary to make it more clear and precise. It can, therefore, be properly said that there was no discussion on the subject, since such views as were expressed by the delegates were only given for the purpose of explaining their votes and the position of their respective governments. The United States delegate who was a member of the committee did not accept the second part of the original project against conquest. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refusal came near causing a failure of arbitration, and to avoid such failure Mr. Blaine had to accept that project.

He desired that the delegates who had accepted the report of the committee should sign it in the shape of a treaty before the Conference closed its sessions. His grounds therefor were that Article I. of the act convening the Conference mentioned as its principal object the consideration and recommendation for adoption of a plan of arbitration. Several delegates, among them the Argentines, were of the opinion that this matter ought not to be treated in a different way from the others, and were willing to sign the recommendation relative to arbitration, provided all the other recommendations adopted by the Conference were signed in the same manner. As there was no time to engross all of them, the formality of signature was, on motion of a delegate from the United States, limited to that concerning arbitration, and this prevented the Argentine delegates from signing it. On that occasion Mr. Blaine's earnestness carried him so far that he thought it necessary to come down from the chair and take the place of a delegate in supporting the motion, which was finally carried. The delegates from Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, and Paraguay did not sign the agreement, although they had voted for it. The delegate from Costa Rica left Washington before the paper was signed. After the close of the Conference a formal treaty was signed by the same delegates who had signed the recommendation, the Venezuelan government having subsequently given its adhesion thereto, as I understand.

It is not unlikely that the division of the Argentine project into two parts, one of which has already been signed as a treaty and the other accepted only as a mere recommendation, may prevent its ratification by the Argentine government.

Although Mr. Blaine was the leading spirit of the arbitration project, he cannot be considered as the author of the form in which it was finally approved by the Conference, because he had to give up much for the purpose of securing the acceptance of the principle of arbitration; but he wrote the preamble to that paper.

The population, territorial extension, trade, wealth, and advanced civilization of the United States make them the greatest and most important nation on this continent, and on this account they had decided advantages over some of the smaller

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nations, which they could easily bring to bear in case of difficulties with them. The plan approved by the Conference deprives them of all these advantages, and places them in the same position as the weakest American nation. It is true that this agreement, equitable as it is in all its bearings, as all the countries participate in it under the most absolute equality, might be made to serve hereafter in establishing the preponderance of the United States; but should they intend to undertake this, they would not bind themselves with an agreement which they would have to break more or less openly before they could take other steps. This appears so clear to my mind that I think it will be difficult to secure the ratification of this agreement by the Senate of the United States.

The Mexican government did not look with good-will, for obvious reasons, at the idea of forced and unrestricted arbitration; and as Article XXI. of the treaty of February 2, 1848, provides ample arbitration with this country, Mexico thought it prudent not to have it extended any further, and instructed its delegates accordingly. We therefore did not intend to take any part in the discussion of this subject, but only to cast our votes in accordance with our instructions when the question was put. But when the Mexican government heard that several South American nations were disposed to go much further than Mexico in the premises, not wishing to appear in disaccord with its sister-republics, it authorized its delegates to extend the scope of arbitration, but not to accept it without limitation.

I had, however, to give up the purpose of taking a passive position on this question, because the Secretary of State requested me in a special manner to prepare a draft of arbitration which, in my opinion, might be acceptable to the Mexican government and the Latin-American states which were not disposed to accept it without limitation. I stated to him, with all candor and sincerity, the obstacles which were in my way in drafting a project which I was not sure would have the support even of my own government; but, in order not to disregard his repeated requests, and because I thought that I might possibly draft something which would be acceptable to all, I consented to take up the matter and to speak on the subject with several of my colleagues. Soon afterwards, however, I found that the difficulties in the way of coming to an agreement

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were insurmountable, and I wholly gave up the attempt. When the report of the committee was discussed in the Conference, the Mexican delegation only expressed the opinion of their government, and voted in accordance with their instructions when they had specific instructions, or with what they understood to be the wishes of their government on new points about which there had been no time to receive instructions.

There were other subjects connected with arbitration which were looked upon in a very different way by Mexico and the South American nations. I refer to the boundary question, and, in fact, to all territorial questions. In the immense territorial area, very thinly populated, of the South American nations, its people being of a homogeneous race and having the same religion, habits, and language, and those nations not having, as a general rule, clearly-marked territorial limits, the boundary questions which have sprung up among themselves are relatively of little importance. A portion of land practically uninhabited does not diminish in any perceptible manner the domain of the nation that may lose it, nor increase in a large way the power of the nation which may acquire it, nor make any change of race in the inhabitants. This is not the case as between Mexico and the United States, because they are countries inhabited by different races, speaking different languages, having different customs, religions, and habits, and because the proportion of population, wealth, and material strength between them constitutes a very different condition of things. The boundary disputes in South America have generally been decided, and with a great deal of reason too, by arbitration, and in the minds of its statesmen it is the belief that, if arbitration is good for anything, it is precisely to end such disputes. Perhaps it is the best way to solve them in any case; but to make arbitration obligatory as to all questions, including the boundary difficulties, which may arise between Mexico and the United States, would be equivalent to placing Mexico in an unfavorable position. Therefore such a broad stipulation, which is not only desirable, but even necessary, in South America, could not be accepted by Mexico. This explains why Mexico could not follow her sister-republics in all the details of this subject.

Reciprocity treaties have a great rôle to perform in the development of commercial relations between the Spanish American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nations and the United States, but, unfortunately, public opinion is not yet prepared in this country to accept them. The subject of reciprocity is far more complicated than it appears to be, since it is connected with the protection and free-trade questions which are now so earnestly agitated in this country. The United States, as an eminently Anglo-Saxon nation, have always followed, although sometimes with slowness, the footsteps of the mother-country, in many cases even surpassing her; and, although thus far they do not seem disposed to accept free trade, which has done so much to secure the commercial preponderance of England, I have no doubt that before long they will not remain behind Great Britain in this regard; but as the ultra-protective policy prevails here at present, it is not possible to accept reciprocity. The United States is yet an agricultural country; it is beginning to be a manufacturing one, and in this stage is making very rapid strides. When the production of manufactured articles shall exceed the needs of the home market, the protective system will have no reason to stand; production will then be cheapened; new foreign markets will be sought for the surplus products; but until then this country will be a mercantile nation. Reciprocity treaties will represent the transition between these two stages, and, therefore, for the present they are premature.

The fate of the reciprocity treaty signed with Mexico in 1883 demonstrates the correctness of this view. That treaty, which was initiated by this government, was made with a country contiguous with it for nearly two thousand miles, and which is inhabited by twelve millions of people, who produce, in proportion to their population, very few manufactured articles, but who have all the elements of soil, climate, and labor necessary to produce the raw materials needed by the manufacturing industries of the United States. That nation, too, is connected with the United States by four trunk railways built by North American companies, which are really extensions and feeders of the trunk lines of this country. It is clear that, if reciprocity could not be established with Mexico, much less can it be adopted with the other American nations, which do not have such favorable conditions, excepting perhaps Brazil, which has developed a very large trade with the United States. It has been found impossible to carry out the reciprocity treaty with Mexico, which intended,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the exemption of duty on Mexican sugar, to open new sources of production and trade. Moreover, on account of regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, this country has nearly closed its doors to the chief article of Mexican export, mineral ore—an industry which has been developed by the construction of railroads in Mexico, this ore being the principal article that they transport, and which has been encouraged and increased by the capital and skill of this country.

The main reason why the reciprocity treaty with Mexico has not been put in operation has been the opposition to receiving, free of duty, Mexican sugar, notwithstanding that, as compensation for such advantage, Mexico made valuable concessions to this country; and yet in the Tariff Bill recently approved by the House of Representatives, and favorably reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate (known as the McKinley Bill), foreign sugar is exempted from all import duties, without any compensation or advantage in favor of the national production of other articles. That bill, if it ever becomes a law, will strike a terrible blow not only at reciprocity treaties, but at the increase of the trade of the United States with the other nations of this continent.

This matter was, undoubtedly, the one that was considered most fully in the Conference, and the one which commanded the most earnest attention. The committee agreed as to the difficulty of establishing a customs union, in the sense of a Zollverein, and as to the desirability of making reciprocity treaties to promote trade between the respective countries. On this point, however, the committee was divided, as the Brazilian, Colombian, Venezuelan, Nicaraguan, and Mexican members of it recommended the negotiation of such treaties, not upon a uniform basis, but in accordance with the circumstances and needs of each country, while the Argentine and Chilian delegates thought it officiousness on the part of the Conference to make any such recommendation. The Argentine government favors reciprocity treaties, since in 1875 it proposed to the United States the negotiation of one, and, as the Argentine delegate who was a member of the committee stated in the discussion, the same suggestion was renewed by the Argentine delegation to the chairman of the United States delegation in the Conference. This gentleman, who was a member of the committee, also favored reciprocity, but he did not ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cept without limitation the report agreed upon by the majority of his colleagues.

The essential difference between the views of the majority and the minority of the committee was that the majority thought they ought not to discourage the negotiation of reciprocity treaties, even if this was only for the purpose of leaving on the United States the responsibility of their failure, while the minority preferred to appear as discouraging them, although really they seemed convinced of the advantages of such treaties and wished to negotiate them.

The discussion on this subject was carried on mainly between the delegates of the Argentine Republic and the United States who were members of the committee; but it properly related to the economic policy of both countries rather than to the convenience of negotiating reciprocity treaties. The Conference finally approved the recommendation of the majority in favor of such treaties, and refused to give a vote against customs union, because it thought this was a slight to the law convening the Conference, and because the United States delegates were among the first to acknowledge the impracticability of such a union. The minority had to reconsider the abrupt manner in which they rejected the customs union.

Mr. Blaine attached a great deal of importance to this matter, and the decided interest which he took in it was only revealed several months after the adjournment of the Conference. Conscious of the many advantages which will accrue to his country by the negotiation of such treaties, he did all that was in his power before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, which was at the time preparing a tariff bill, for the purpose of inducing it to accept such a basis as would favor the negotiation of these treaties. The official and private utterances of Mr. Blaine which have since appeared show very plainly the great importance he attached to the subject, and the interest he felt in it was so great that he even went so far as to antagonize his own political party. For the failure of reciprocity treaties he, therefore, cannot be responsible. The Argentine delegates, who were not aware of all his efforts, very likely thought that he was indifferent to their proposal, but subsequent events have shown that this was not the case.

The result proves very clearly how little the real condition of things was appreciated by some of the manufacturing nations of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe when they feared that the United States would negotiate reciprocity treaties with the American republics that might interfere with their own present commercial relations.

Another of the principal questions submitted to the Conference was the monetary union. In this question the Conference took a step backward. The law of Congress which convened it submitted to the Conference the consideration of the convenience of "coining a silver coin of the same weight and fineness, which would be a legal-tender in all the American nations." The Conference decided to recommend the meeting in Washington of another special conference with a view to decide about the coining of *one or more coins*, without stating the metal of which they should be coined, of the same weight and fineness, to be used in the nations represented in the Conference, without stating whether they should be a legal-tender in all of them. All, or almost all, the Latin-American nations preferred the basis laid down in the convening law, but they had to yield on this point so as to act in accordance with the United States, whose delegates, excepting one, Mr. Estee, were decidedly opposed to the coining of legal-tender silver money. The law recently approved by the Congress of the United States regarding the coinage of silver very likely will influence the policy of this administration when this matter is again brought up.

The part which the Montevidean treaties took in the Conference ought not to be omitted. It is known that the principal nations of South America met in congress in Montevideo in 1888, and accepted common rules upon private, international, penal procedure, patents, trade-marks, copyright, extradition, etc., etc. The broadness and details of these rules have prevented some of the nations which attended that congress, and whose plenipotentiaries signed the treaties, from accepting them all. The Mexican government, which, at the request of the Argentine Republic, has been studying those treaties for more than a year, has not as yet come to any conclusion about them. As the rules accepted in these treaties are those prevailing in the nations which follow the Roman law, and as the United States are ruled by the English or common law, it was very difficult for this country to accept the treaties in all their details, since that would be equivalent to changing the basis of their legislation. This explains the opposition of the United States delegation to these treaties. Notwith-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standing all this, three of them—those relating to copyrights, trade-marks, and patents—were accepted by the United States delegate who was a member of the committee, and, finally, by the delegation when the matter was brought to a vote before the Conference.

The Conference took up, besides, several other subjects which, although important in themselves, appear in a secondary light when compared with those I have mentioned. I refer to the recommendation favoring a uniform system of weights and measures; those in favor of the Montevidean treaties on trade-marks, copyrights, and patents; and those to adopt uniform and liberal rules for the valuation of merchandise at the custom-houses; to simplify the import and consular dues; to establish in Washington an international bureau of information on commercial subjects; to accept any of the South American conventions for sanitary purposes; to establish railways and lines of steamers among the several nations; to negotiate extradition treaties; to establish an international bank for the purpose of carrying on the exchanges now made through London; and to study, with a view to their adoption, all the other Montevidean treaties. These matters are generally known, as they were published when adopted, and I therefore deem it unnecessary to say a word more about them.

The first result of the Conference—and I mention it in the first place because all the others depend on the ratification of the respective governments, which may or may not be accorded, while this is an effective one and will exercise great influence for some time to come—was the mutual acquaintance through their representatives of the different nations, which, being great distances apart and without any communication among themselves, were almost unknown to each other. The daily intercourse of the delegates for nearly six months, discussing important questions which affect the paramount interests of their respective countries, was to many of them a revelation of the importance and the condition of the states represented in the Conference. There is, therefore, no exaggeration in considering as its first result the sentiment of mutual respect and consideration which each delegate acquired for his colleagues and for the nations represented by them; and so far as the United States are concerned, this result was obtained not only among its delegates, but among

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the governments and the people who had the opportunity of being daily informed of the doings of the Conference.

The second place belongs to the agreement on arbitration, which will be, if ratified by the various nations, a transcendent and very important measure. This by itself would be enough to make the Conference highly memorable and fruitful.

In regard to the monetary convention the Conference took a step backward, if bimetallism is a desideratum.

The other results of the Conference, although important in themselves, are far inferior to those that I have already mentioned.

At first sight it might appear that the results of the Conference have been disappointing; but I think it can be safely said that its success has been greater than there was any reason to expect. Almost all of the Latin-American nations came to Washington with a fear that the United States intended to impose upon them its material superiority, and they went back satisfied that, far from being so, this country had only sentiments of respect and consideration for its sister-republics, and that the United States simply intended to accomplish what was of mutual advantage to all, itself acting on the same footing as the smallest of the nations represented.

On the other hand, I believe that the Latin-American republics have left on the government and the people of the United States a more lasting and favorable impression than they had before been able to make. That was almost equivalent to a revelation for these people, as it gave an opportunity to form a better idea of their civilization, the material progress of their respective countries, and the worth and patriotism of their sons; and it has been, too, better understood that uniformity of practices and good understanding are almost a necessity among all the American nations. Remembering that great results in behalf of mankind cannot be reached in one day, and much less when success depends on several countries affected by different influences and conditions, I have no doubt that the meeting in Washington of an assembly in which all the American nations were represented has been as greatly advantageous to the government and the people which promoted it and carried it into effect as to the other governments which sent their delegates.

M. ROMERO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A KEY TO MUNICIPAL REFORM.

BY E. L. GODKIN, EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK "EVENING POST."

THAT there was a time within the remembrance of men now living when there was a great deal of pride in the city and interest in municipal affairs, among the inhabitants of New York, admits of no doubt whatever. The municipal records, the newspaper reports, the biographies and diaries, and the memory of old residents, all agree that at one period, which only came to an end, or neared its end, about forty years ago, municipal offices were objects of ambition to really eminent citizens—that is, to men conspicuous for their high personal character, for their well-established social position, or their professional or commercial success. Such men were very glad to be made mayors, or to become members of the Board of Aldermen or Common Council, and the voters, or the appointing power, sought in these categories candidates for such offices as a matter of course, or, I might term it, as one of the ordinary and inevitable decencies of municipal government.

To illustrate this by example would take more space than an article of this sort will allow, but any one can readily illustrate it for himself by going over a list of the mayors, and inquiring what was the standing in the community of any one of those who held the office, say, down to the year 1846. Very much the same thing may be said of the members of the Board of Aldermen or Common Council, by whatever name it was known. There existed at the period of which I am now speaking, in as much force in New York as in any other city in the Union, the old Anglo-Saxon tradition of "respectability"—that is, the tradition which requires that the incumbent of an office of much authority or responsibility

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall be a conspicuous person, with whose history and character the community is familiar, and who is marked out for the place by the process of natural selection which produced the earlier American Presidents, and still produces the British Prime Minister, but which in all democratic countries shows a tendency to decay under the influence of the system of artificial selection, or nomination by conventions.

Of course this fastidiousness about the quality of municipal officers must have created, and, there is plenty of evidence to show, did actually create, a strong popular interest in city administration and a good deal of pride in the way the corporation was represented before the world. This is not saying that the city was nearly as well supplied with comforts and conveniences as it now is, or that its municipal machinery was nearly as perfect. It had no public water supply; it was poorly lighted; it had no system of public schools and little or no police, and was so primitive in its notions of municipal propriety that the pigs ran loose in the streets. Science and experience and increased wealth have put a hundred means and appliances of health and security within reach of the present generation which were by no endeavor attainable in those days. All that I contend for is that men at that time lived up to such lights as they had touching the best conditions of municipal life, and had a satisfaction in their citizenship which is now unknown.

To explain the change which has since taken place in the attitude of the more intelligent portion of the voters towards the municipality and its belongings is to explain the crisis through which municipal politics are now passing. For the honest truth about our municipal troubles is that they are due not so much to a particular kind of legislation as to a particular state of mind among the people; and no suggestion of a remedy would be adequate or complete without some examination of this state of mind.

The change began, as I have pointed out in a former article in this REVIEW, almost immediately after the adoption of the constitution of 1846, which gave the suffrage to all adult white males. As the population of the city was then composed, the effect of this in city politics would have been, for a while at least, weak or insignificant, if it had not been that there was at the same time a sudden and marked increase in the immigration from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe, partly owing to the famine in Ireland and partly to the troubles on the continent of Europe during the years following 1848.

As the city grew, the majority adhered firmly to the Democratic party, while the State, after going through several permutations, finally settled down as Republican almost as soon as the Republican party came into existence. It is remarkable, and important, that the State Senate has had a Republican majority every year since 1854, except 1870, 1874, 1881, and 1882, and in these years the Democratic majority was very trifling. In the Assembly the Republicans have had a majority since 1854 in every year except 1862 (when there was a tie), 1869 and 1870, 1874, 1881, and 1882, but the Democratic majority in these exceptional years was, as in the Senate, very small. During all this period the city has given Democratic majorities every year except 1861. An explanation of this divergence of political opinion and feeling between the urban and rural population would need an article to itself. It is due, like other political and social phenomena, to a composition of causes. But it is not necessary for my present purpose to explain it.

The feature in this divergence to which I wish to call attention is its permanence, and the failure of the Republicans, though holding the State government for nearly the whole period in all its branches, to make any perceptible impression on the majority in the city. They began their attacks on it in 1857, by taking the control of the police force out of the hands of the city authorities, and have since then scarcely allowed a year to pass without some change in the city charter, or some redistribution of city offices, with the avowed intention of destroying the Democratic supremacy. These attempts, too, have been vigorously supported ever since 1861 by the lavish use of the enormous Federal patronage concentrated in New York through the custom-house, the post-office, and the Federal courts, and by a Federal act providing for the supervision of the local elections by Federal officers. About 1870 an effort was made by the late President Arthur to supplement these instrumentalities by the creation of a Republican "machine," intended to counteract the Tammany Society by the use of agencies similar to those employed by Tammany, and kept in operation by the use of Federal offices, just as the Tammany machine was by the use of municipal offices. To make it more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effective, a certain number of a then novel kind of politician in the shape of Republican Irishmen, typified by "Johnny" O'Brien and "Mike" Cregan, were enlisted in it, and became its leaders and managers. These men were meant to fight the devil with fire—that is, defeat Tammany by the use of its own arts. This device also proved a failure. It never was sufficient to rescue the city from the Democrats. The most it has ever been able to accomplish has been to secure to the Republicans a certain share of the city offices by bargains with the Democrats, made either through the Republican majority in the Legislature or by direct negotiation with the Tammany leaders in this city. During this long period the Republicans have been able to elect only one mayor, Mr. Opdyke, as a Republican, unless Mr. Havemeyer was entitled to that appellation—which I doubt. It would seem, therefore, as if the Democratic majority in this city were a fixed quantity, and as if its destruction by any weapons within the reach of its opponents were something which for practical purposes cannot be considered within reach, or even within sight.

The Republicans, although they undoubtedly comprise the more intelligent and well-to-do portion of the population, have no influence, intellectual or moral, on the bulk of the Democratic voters, and have in local canvasses no effective power of persuasion or conversion. This is a singular phenomenon. I doubt if the like of it is to be found in any other city, except possibly Paris. Neither the rich, nor the moral, nor the educated have in thirty years succeeded in making any impression whatever on the political opinions of the Democratic masses. In competing for influence over them, they have been always hopelessly distanced by the ordinary Tammany committee-men and district leaders. Neither through its books, nor its sermons, nor its newspapers does what is called the "Better Element" of the Republican party reach the Democratic rank and file. There has never been in the past forty years any successful political evangelization done by it in this city, although it spends millions in various forms of philanthropic and missionary effort. It and its agents are beaten at every turn, as political and moral influences, by the Tammany liquor-dealers and ward politicians.

In order to protect themselves against the grosser consequences of Democratic ignorance and corruption, Republicans have been compelled to fly to Albany and ask for some sort of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

temporary relief in the shape of special legislation. This has had two unfortunate results. It has, in the first place, ended—it is to be hoped not permanently—in debauching the Legislature by presenting every year to it a rich community in the attitude of a suppliant for deliverance from some sort of local evil. This annually-recurring demand for legislative help against the local majority, generally made by people who are well known to be able to pay for it, has naturally led the members from the country districts to treat the city as the oyster of needy men, to welcome petitions for relief in particular exigencies, and to turn their attention away from the construction of any general constitutional framework of city government. To a large majority of the legislators in both houses, legislation about New York city is much the most attractive feature of their sessions. Without it their task would be exceedingly dull, and to many of them very unprofitable. Any one who goes over the newspaper records of the legislative work of the sessions of the last forty years will find that all, or nearly all, the great Albany struggles, excitements, and scandals have arisen out of some attempt to legislate touching the distribution of municipal offices.

Nor is the evil confined to the excessive or corrupt legislative meddling with city affairs, or to attempts to "strike" wealthy corporations through taxation. It is made almost as manifest in the reluctance of the party in power to provide for the most needful city improvements, owing to its unwillingness to intrust the spending of large sums of money to the local authorities. If the truth were fully known, it would be found that a good many of the local inconveniences from which we suffer—such, for instance, as the poor pavements of our city and the absence of rapid transit—were the results of Republican disbelief in the possibility of getting any great public work honestly executed through the instrumentality of Democratic officials. Republican legislators would probably dislike much, under any circumstances, to put large enterprises, involving the employment of a great deal of labor, into the hands of Tammany agents, but they are supplied with abundant and respectable excuse for this reluctance by the quality of the municipal officers whom we elect. The new court-house and the new aqueduct, the only two great municipal works attempted since the war, both proved large jobs in which local Democrats were the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chief actors. The aqueduct was saved in time, owing to the very audacity of the jobbers ; but both would furnish anybody who defends the kind of supervision now exercised by the State over city affairs with a justification in which it would be hard to pick holes.

From unwillingness to commit public improvements to Democratic hands, to bargaining with the Democrats for a share of the plunder, the distance is not great, and we see illustrations at every session of the Legislature of the strength of the temptation created by Democratic eagerness to get hold of the money. The strain on integrity which the situation creates on both sides is, in fact, greater than human nature can bear, even when it has not been trained in city politics. Nothing can well be more demoralizing for the country member of the Legislature than the power to regulate the affairs of a wealthy community to which he does not belong and whose interests he does not understand. Nothing, too, is more demoralizing for a minority in any community than the discovery that it need not try persuasion on the majority in order to accomplish its ends ; that there is a power outside to which it can appeal to enable it to have its way when elections go against it. Public spirit and a real interest in public affairs cannot shine in a situation of this sort ; and yet this is the situation in which the Republicans of the city have been living for thirty years. Under these circumstances civic pride has well-nigh died out amongst them ; gifts to the city, considering the enormous fortunes which have been made in it during the past fifty years, are extraordinarily scanty ; the tendency to regard the city as a place to make money in, but to live and die out of, has been growing steadily ; and the city is becoming more and more renowned for its dirt, disorder, and discomfort, as well as for its wealth and size.

It is not surprising, all these things considered, that, when we have reached a very bad pass, when there has been some display of more than ordinary dishonesty and incapacity among our city rulers, the first thing which some good people should think of is an expedition to Albany to get the charter changed, or to get somebody legislated out of office, or some officer's power curtailed. Two generations have grown up in familiarity with this sort of reform, and many people can hardly think of any other. Mr. Andrew D. White, the former president of Cornell University, through service in the Legislature, as well as through observation,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very familiar with the New York problem, is still so much under the influence of this Republican tradition that he read a paper at the last meeting of the Social Science Association at Saratoga proposing this very thing—that is, that we should ask for a change in the charter making the mayor and a good-sized Common Council elective on a general ticket to represent "politics," and creating a "Board of Control," with a veto on expenditures, to represent "property."

All experience justifies us in believing that any such Common Council would be simply a hot-bed of politics, and would spend most of its time devising schemes for the abolition of the Board of Control, which it would doubtless accomplish before very long. The Board of Control, too, was an idea of the Tilden Municipal Commission in 1877, embodied in a constitutional amendment which the Legislature refused to submit to the people, and which would certainly have far less chance now than it had then. The truth is that, in the existing state of the New York mind about city government, we cannot bear any more Common Council than we have got; a small body elected by districts, and possessing no powers of any importance, is as much of this sort of machinery as is tolerable. It pleases the lower class of ward politicians, and gives them a few small places with salaries to fight for, and does the rest of the community no great harm.

As regards the finances, the present Board of Apportionment is probably as good a Board of Control as can be desired. It is composed of the mayor, the comptroller, the president of the Board of Taxes and Assessments, and the president of the Board of Aldermen—most of the men actually charged with the administration of the city and responsible for the amount of the expenditures. If we fill these places with first-class men, the board answers all our needs. If we do not, no board would improve our condition. A board representing property-holders simply, with no strong or greatly changed or improved public sentiment behind it, would be simply a target for abuse by the Tammany orators or newspapers, even if it tried to rise above the condition of its origin. There may come a time when New York will be able to support with impunity a large home legislature, with full control of the municipal finances, but it will not be until the traditions of the present *régime* have perished or have been greatly weakened. If such a body were elected now, it would be two-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thirds filled with the kind of persons who now compose the Tammany Executive Committee. Men of good standing and character on both sides would be unwilling to enter it, and it would probably be as venal as the Albany Legislature, if not as the Board of Aldermen, and we should have the air filled with stories of "deals" and "jobs" through most of the year. It would naturally, and, indeed, properly, represent the view of municipal government now held by the bulk of the voters of both parties—the view, namely, that the main object of elections is to decide which of the two parties shall have the control and distribution of the salaried municipal offices.

This is the meaning which the term "politics" now bears in the minds of nine out of ten inhabitants of the city. Of an election as a means of deciding which of two conflicting policies in the management of city affairs shall prevail, the very memory has almost all been lost. When you talk of such an election as a possibility to a very large proportion even of the more intelligent class of the community, you are apt to be set down as visionary and as occupied with schemes which, if practicable anywhere, will only be practicable in the New Jerusalem. We cannot at present get two rival systems of rapid transit, for instance, or two rival schemes of street paving, or two rival systems of taxation, submitted to the popular vote. The only question we can get passed on at the polls is which set of politicians shall have the handling of the money which the scheme—any scheme—will cost. This is our "politics" at present. It is this "politics" which a large municipal council, or any municipal council which had control of the finances, would, in the present state of the public mind, represent.

Now, it is because this state of mind prevails, to all outward appearance, among the intelligent and wealthy just as much as among the poor and ignorant, that the power of the semi-criminal organization known as Tammany Hall over the latter not only remains unshaken, but grows stronger from year to year. Every year its management descends, with perfect impunity, into the hands of a more and more degraded class. This year only one regular honest calling is represented in its Executive Committee. But no Republican is able to make any appeal to the better instincts of the Tammany voters based on the loftier views or the purer practice of his own party. He cannot try to sow in the minds of such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voters the seeds of civic pride, because he cannot point to any signs of such pride among his own people. He cannot descant on the folly or wickedness of sacrificing the interests of the city to Federal interests, because he does that very thing himself whenever he gets a chance. He votes for the mayor with a view to affecting the election to the Presidency, or in order to help or hinder legislation on the tariff. He assists this year in ousting a good man from a city office, or in putting a weaker one in, solely as a preparation for getting control of the custom-house or post-office some other year. In fact, he shows no more concern in his municipal action for the physical and moral welfare of Pat or Hans in a tenement-house on Avenue A than Pat or Hans shows for his in his brown-stone dwelling on Madison Avenue.

It is impossible for any one who goes canvassing among Tammany voters on behalf of the municipal welfare to point to a good example of any kind, or to any striking evidences of what I may call a municipal conscience, among the property-holders who grumble so fiercely about the smallness of the return they get in New York for their taxes. In no city in Christendom to-day have the poor been left by their more fortunate neighbors and fellow-citizens so completely as in this to the tender mercies of demagogues and thieves and imposters. The attempt to get rid of responsibility for their social and moral and physical surroundings by proffering them religious instruction or free pews in Protestant churches, while treating the condition of their dwellings, the police which protects them, the courts from which they get their justice, the hospitals in which they find refuge from sickness and misfortune, the sanitary regulations from which they acquire their notions of American decency and order, as "politics," with which clergymen and business men, and "nice people" generally, cannot be expected to have anything to do, is surely taking the lowest view of it—an immense shame and scandal; but it fully explains the municipal situation at present.

The conclusion to which all this brings us, if it be well founded, is that the work of municipal reform is really a work of education. No change in the machinery of government would do us any good without a radical change in the way of looking at municipal administration on the part of the more intelligent class of voters. There never has been an occasion in politics which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

called more distinctly for a rending of our hearts rather than of our garments. That a change in the direction I have indicated will be difficult, and need a good deal of time to become thoroughly effective, there is no doubt. The tendency of men who are engaged in political movements of any kind to act within party lines, and to prefer party associates for all places of trust, is very strong and has a good deal to be said for it. It is doubtless easier to work in city affairs with those with whom we have been accustomed to work in Federal and State affairs. We have a confidence in their motives and a comprehension of their point of view which are apt to be wanting with regard to opponents in other fields. It is hard to believe that a Democrat is aiming at the things that we are aiming at in local affairs, knowing how widely separated from him we are in national or State affairs.

Nor is there anything novel or peculiarly American in this difficulty. It has been fully experienced by reformers in other countries. The old municipalities in England were hot-beds of politics in our sense of the term. But it has been overcome. In all the great cities of parliamentary European countries, in one way or another the lesson of treating the municipality as a business corporation has been learned, and is acted on. Radicals and Conservatives have learned, as a solemn duty, to treat cleanliness, and police and drainage, and water supply as questions of business and philanthropy to be settled on their own merits, from which there is, for honest and humane men, no escape. In this lies the solution of the great municipal problem. There is no other way in which modern cities can be saved.

E. L. Godkin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CROWNS AND CORONETS.

REMINISCENCES OF A PORTRAIT-PAINTER.

BY G. P. A. HEALY.

AT TIMES when I look back upon my long career it seems to me like a tale of olden times, of some mortal guided through forests and over mountains, across seas and plains, by a familiar and capricious spirit. My guide brought me through many a strait and led me into very unexpected worlds.

As a mere boy, in Boston, I was fortunate enough to have as a sitter a very charming and beautiful woman, a leader of fashion of those far-away days, Mrs. Otis, and in an odd, round-about way it was due to her that I painted my first portrait in the world of crowns and coronets.

One day—it was in 1834—I was working in the Louvre very earnestly from that most adorable of pictures, Correggio's "Mystical Marriage of St. Catherine."

My impression when I first saw that wonderful gallery was that really the old masters were singularly overrated; that, if their fame had not been consecrated by the admiration of several centuries, people would be willing to admit that we modern artists—I dare say I added we Yankees—were quite capable of painting as well and with more dash and brilliancy. Perhaps many a young and audacious ignoramus has thought and even said as much before and since. When I began to open my eyes, to learn my art, to copy these old masters, I began also to understand that the admiration of centuries was perhaps justified, and that it might require some years of hard work before I quite came up to Raphael, Vinci, or Correggio.

At any rate, I was, that day, doing my best, as humbly as I then knew how, to copy the "Marriage," when I suddenly felt

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that I was no longer alone before my easel. Visitors, English visitors especially, would often, while visiting the Louvre, stop and look at the various copies. These two, husband and wife evidently, pleasant-looking people, were English, and questioned me with interest. Then they moved off with a few kindly words of praise, and I never expected to see them again.

A little later I started for Italy—a pilgrimage which tempts every young painter—and naturally I travelled as economically as possible. Generally my journeys were accomplished on foot; but Italy is a long way off, and I crossed Mont Cenis in the stage-coach. At Alexandria we stopped to rest, and the first people I saw at the inn were the English travellers. To my great surprise and pleasure they recognized me and spoke. In Switzerland they had met a friend to whom, incidentally, they had mentioned the young American painter; the friend, who was Mrs. Otis, exclaimed: "Why, that must be George!" And so "George" seemed no longer a stranger to them, and Sir Arthur Brooke Faulkner and his charming wife became the kindest friends and patrons of the unknown American painter.

Sir Arthur and Lady Faulkner travelled in their own carriage. They most graciously offered me a place in it for the rest of the journey; I need not say how eagerly I accepted. In these days of steam we rush through the countries we visit; we do not really see them. Travelling in a comfortable, venerable-looking coach, ingeniously packed with all sorts of portable luxuries, roomy and easy, stopping where and when one chooses, is a delight of which our young people can scarcely form an idea. My enthusiasm for the lovely country in which we found ourselves was enhanced by the delights of a new and warm friendship. By the time we reached Naples it was an understood thing that I should before long go to London and meet my kind English friends.

Events seemed about to shape my career into that of an English artist. Sir Arthur Faulkner, whose position in the London world was a high one, obtained sittings for me from the Duke of Sussex, uncle to the present Queen. This was a splendid opening for a young painter, and I did my very best. The portrait proved successful and brought me various commissions and some notice.

The Duke of Sussex, who was in those days a middle-aged man, and usually wore a velvet cap on his bald head, was most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amiable and simple. He had made a left-handed marriage—he was not the only one of the family who had done so; only he remained faithful to his chosen mate—with a lady who bore the title of Duchess of Inverness. She was a very little woman, just five feet tall, and he was a man of superb stature—six feet four inches. But in that big body beat a very soft and tender heart.

Lady Agnes Buller, twin sister of the Duke of Northumberland, was one of the most kind and charming of my sitters at that time, toward 1839. Her conversation was very interesting, but certain faults of pronunciation contracted in the nursery were still perceptible, in spite of education and intelligence. She was nearly always obliged to repeat the word "picture" to get it right, being always tempted to say "pictur." She envied the children of modest parents who were not shut up with nursery governesses and maids.

Lord and Lady Waldegrave also ordered their portraits. Lady Waldegrave was the daughter of the famous singer Braham. This delightful tenor's name was really Abraham; but the children of Israel not being yet in odor of sanctity, he thought he might Christianize himself by signing it A. Braham.

One of my pleasantest remembrances of those days was a holiday spent most joyously by my young wife (I had just married), some artist friends, and myself. During a sitting Lord Waldegrave exclaimed: "You ought to visit Strawberry Hill; it is classical ground." Strawberry Hill was his country seat at Twickenham, on the Thames. He sent orders to his housekeeper to prepare a good luncheon for us. We started early, taking boat on the river, and I doubt whether a merrier party of young people ever enjoyed a more perfect day. I do not know what the correct servants in livery who waited on us thought of these Americans who filled the superb dining-room with their jokes and laughter; but I am sure they considered that our people are endowed with remarkable appetites.

Strawberry Hill, which had belonged to Horace Walpole, is beautifully situated, with magnificent gardens sloping down to the river. It was here that Walpole wrote his famous "Letters." Here also, probably, he received many a charming missive from the Marquise du Deffand, the blind old woman so full of wit and charm, whose last romance—a very maternal sort of romance, of course—was woven in honor of the fascinating Englishman.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I remember another romantic incident of these early years. I painted a small whole-length portrait of the Master of Grant, the head of the clan, in his Highland dress. He was a superb-looking man and a great favorite with the fair sex. He died suddenly soon after I had finished my work. Two ladies of very high rank ordered a copy of my portrait to be painted secretly and sent to them under lock and key. I never learned the exact truth with regard to these clients of mine, but, naturally, my imagination built up a romance about this mysterious order.

I had thus obtained, at this period of my life, an excellent English connection. It seemed as though I had but to continue doing my very best to please my aristocratic patrons in order to arrive at a good position and fortune. An incident interrupted my course, and my life was shaped after a very different fashion.

Our Minister at the court of France was then General Cass. He and his family were most kind to me and remained my very stanch and warm friends to the end. I had painted in 1838 a large portrait of the General. He one day said to the King, Louis Philippe: "I wish your Majesty would allow a young countryman of mine to paint your portrait." The King smilingly gave a vague promise, which, like many royal promises, came to nothing. But when he visited the annual exhibition, which then took place in the Louvre, he examined the General's portrait with interest, and asked abruptly where the young fellow who painted it was at that time. "In London, Sire." "Tell him that, if he will come to Paris, I am willing to sit to him." Naturally I was soon at His Majesty's orders.

General Cass presented me to the King, and remained during the whole of the first sitting. I remember that the conversation turned especially on Fieschi, who had just been executed. Louis Philippe was not tender on the subject of king-killers, and said: "My dear General, my countrypeople like to play at being heroes; but I shall let them see that I have the guillotine and the galleys at their service." He spoke English most admirably, using it not only correctly, but by no means disdaining familiar expressions. He was perfectly simple, natural, and cordial; full of sympathy, too, for Americans, and remembering his stay in America with pleasure. With his subjects, however, the King revealed himself, at times, in a most unexpected manner.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On one occasion—it was one of the early sittings devoted to deciding on the attitude—I was making a chalk drawing of the King. While we were trying various views of the head, the *aide-de-camp de service* who assisted at the sitting and who, doubtless, was more accustomed to the life of the camp than to that of the court, threw himself into an exaggerated and theatrical attitude, exclaiming: "*Voilà une pose Sire!*" The King frowned and said severely: "*Monsieur le général!*" The poor general instantly bowed so low that he seemed to double up, to collapse, and he humbly muttered: "*Je rétracte, Sire, je rétracte!*" It was an insignificant little incident, but it showed me clearly what were, inevitably, the relations of sovereign and courtier.

Louis Philippe grew interested in his portrait, and his family with him. Madame Adelaide especially, sister to the King, never missed a sitting, and I saw familiarly at that time many famous men whose names are now historical; among others, Maréchal Soult, then Minister of War, whom I painted later.

The King's portrait, which belonged to General Cass, proved a success. Louis Philippe sent for me one morning and said: "Mr. Healy, I understand that I was seen last evening at your Minister's in very good company—between Washington and Guizot, both painted by you. Where and how did you copy your Washington?" I had simply copied it from an engraving after Stuart's portrait of Washington, not having the original within my reach. The King then told me that while he and his brother were in the United States they had seen Stuart at work on the portrait of Washington ordered by Mrs. Bingham; during the sittings Washington conversed with the young princes. The King added: "And I want you to make me a copy of that very portrait."

The great difficulty was to know where to find it. Louis Philippe said he would write at once to his Ambassador to London, the Comte de Saint Aulaire, and that I was to return in a week's time to hear the result of his inquiries. When I was next summoned to the Tuileries, the King exclaimed, as soon as he saw me: "Mr. Healy, we are dished! The portrait is in Russia, and, under present circumstances, I can ask nothing of the Russian government. What are we to do? I must have my Washington. I have set my heart on it!" I proposed to copy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the whole-length portrait which hangs in Faneuil Hall, in Boston. "No, no; that is in his military uniform, and I want him as the President of the United States, in his black velvet suit. Will you start for America, and do for the best? I leave the whole affair in your hands. You might copy the portrait which Mrs. Madison cut from its frame in 1812, when the English burnt the city of Washington. At any rate I shall approve whatever you decide to do."

And so it was that the unquiet spirit which all my life has turned my steps now here, now there, sent me back to America. The President, John Tyler, allowed me to paint in the room where the portrait, a rather feeble imitation of Stuart, hung, and still hangs. Later, when I passed through London, I incidentally learned that the portrait which Louis Philippe fancied was in Russia was in reality close to Portland Place, having been purchased by an American, the late John D. Lewis. The trustees of the estate allowed me to finish my copy from it. The King graciously declared himself well pleased with my work, and gave me orders for various other copies, which are still to be seen in the Palace of Versailles.

Among these copies were to be certain historical portraits belonging to the Queen of England. It was not easy to obtain permission to copy in Windsor Castle, but a king's request is always granted. I had the opportunity while working in what was then called the Waterloo Gallery—the name was changed later, when Napoleon III. visited Windsor—of noticing the difference of etiquette in the two courts. Louis Philippe never seemed to consider it beneath his kingly dignity to be pleasant and kind. Queen Victoria evidently feared to address an obscure commoner.

I was, one day, at work copying the portrait of Lord Bathurst by Lawrence, when the Queen and Prince Albert crossed the gallery and stopped to look at what I was doing. As she wished for some details as to the order the King of France had given me, etc., she turned to her husband, saying, "Ask Mr. Healy if . . . etc.," and Prince Albert put the questions to me, as though he had been translating from a foreign tongue. Then she exclaimed, looking at my copy, "It is very like," and, with the slightest possible bend of the head, passed on. I own that my American blood rather boiled in my veins. But my in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dignation did not prevent me from looking very hard at Her Majesty. I was struck by the delicacy of the features and complexion of the young Queen, and by the extreme elegance of her very handsome husband. This was in 1841.

The revolution of 1848, which sent Louis Philippe to England, an exile, deprived me of my royal patron and ended my fortune in France. My English connection was lost, most of my kind friends being dead or dispersed. During this long period I had gone frequently to the United States, and there had painted many people of note, and made many stanch friends; but I had always returned to France. In 1855 I went to Chicago for the first time, and a year later my family joined me. It seemed then as though I was never likely again to have anything more to do with kings, queens, or princes.

Overwork having brought on a state of nervous prostration, I made up my mind, in 1866, to return to Europe. As long as I remained in Chicago I was certain to do more than my strength would permit, as I have never known how to refuse a good order, and prolonged sleeplessness was beginning to tell on my health. My family sailed for France in June, 1866, and I followed just a year later, in time for the Universal Exhibition.

We spent some years in Rome, where I worked with more moderation than in America, and my health became excellent once more. And it was in Rome that, very unexpectedly, I again found myself the painter of princely sitters.

In 1869 the Duke of Nassau visited the different Roman studios. He wished to have a portrait of his young niece, the Princess Oldenburg, then affianced to the Duke of Weimar. I was fortunate enough to be chosen, and the Princess, a fair young girl of about seventeen, gave me sittings. Her proposed husband watched the progress of the portrait, and I was then painfully impressed with the evident want of sympathy which existed between the affianced pair. However, the preparations for the wedding went on. It was on the very eve of the marriage-day that the poor young bride found courage to break it off. The affair, an almost unheard-of one in the world to which she belonged, made a terrible stir. I must say that my most hearty sympathies were with my gentle, fair young sitter.

But if the Duke of Weimar's visits to my studio were not always perfectly pleasant, another visitor was welcome as sunshine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself. This was a cousin of the young Princess of Oldenburg, the exquisite and charming Princess of Roumania, since Queen of that country. She had been sent to Rome for her health and was greatly enjoying all she saw; enjoying also her freedom from court etiquette, and, I think, maliciously reducing the lady of honor and the chamberlain who accompanied her to the verge of despair.

Before the portrait of her cousin was quite finished, the Princess of Roumania ordered hers, as a surprise for her husband. I painted her dressed in the national costume; it consisted of a sort of embroidered chemise, with long loose sleeves, an open jacket, a red skirt embroidered in gold, red morocco boots, and a thin tissue veil covering the whole costume, also embroidered in red and gold. The dress was very becoming to her; her expressive face was almost perfect, the only defect being a rather high forehead. Since those days she has worn her hair according to the present fashion, cut and curled on the forehead, so that this slight defect is no longer noticeable.

Of late years the Queen of Roumania has become well known and has been much written about in America as well as in Europe. Under the name of Carmen Sylva she has published poems and novels, meditations and dramatic works, not only in German, her native tongue, but also in French. Last year she was crowned by the French Academy, and Pierre Loti, the author of "Pécheurs d' Islande," has just dedicated his last book to her. But some twenty years ago, when she visited my studio, and told me, during the long sittings, all about her home life, "Carl," her husband, her lovely little baby girl,—so soon, alas! to be taken from her,—her enthusiasm about her adopted country, and her desire to do everything humanly possible for the happiness of her people, the Princess was scarcely known beyond her own circle and the privileged few who were admitted to her charming presence.

She was born Princess of Neuwied, a very small and modest principality on the Rhine, and she was brought up by her admirable mother as simply as any country girl of her neighborhood. Her education, however, was most complete; she speaks English and French as perfectly as her own tongue, and with no vestige of accent. She is an excellent musician, and has a curious talent for miniature-painting and old-fashioned illuminating. All that she does she seems to do with perfect facility, and whatever her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

task may be, she accomplishes it with as much ardor as though her whole future depended upon its success.

I think that all who have approached the Queen of Roumania will agree with me when I say that no woman was ever more thoroughly a woman, more daintily refined, more genuinely warm-hearted, kind, compassionate, more enamored of all that is pure and noble. And if ever these lines meet her eyes, I rejoice to think that the homage of her American painter may not displease her.

In the course of the sittings the Princess questioned me about the different members of my family. I own to a weakness which I have often tried in vain to overcome. I cannot refrain from talking about my wife and children; and just about that time my first grandson was born, so that he also came in for a share of fond gossip. The Princess seeming interested,—I have said how indulgent she was,—I ventured to say that, if she wished to confer a great favor on her painter and dine at his house, he would then present the members of his family to her. "But I should delight to dine with you, Mr. Healy; it would be such fun!" And she really did seem to enjoy the dinner, and the absolute lack of etiquette and ceremony, the hearty pleasure each and all felt in her sweet presence. Only I fear that her lady of honor suffered cruelly! The Princess was so gay, so happy, so delighted with the music of a French "Grand Prix de Rome" from the Villa Medicis hard by, so full of admiration for the beauty of our American countrywomen, that surely court etiquette, as represented by the worthy lady, must have been at every moment ruffled and exasperated.

I was sincerely most sorry when the portrait was finished and my charming sitter had gone back to her adopted country. But in 1872 I was called to Roumania by the Prince, and I remained at the court some months, painting various portraits of the Prince, of his wife, and their beautiful little daughter, who died shortly after. It was their only child, and they have had none since, to their very great sorrow.

I painted the little girl's portrait, not at Bucharest, but in the mountains, at Sinaia, where the court spends all the warm months. The King has since built a beautiful palace on the wooded mountain slope, but when I first went to Sinaia the palace was only planned, and we lodged as best we could—not very well, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

truth—in an old monastery, where we had some difficulty in finding a painting-room of any sort. But I worked out of doors a great deal. The little Princess is represented seated on a rock in the woods, and her mother, dressed in the national costume, which she habitually wears, is seen behind the child, and half hidden by her.

It was agreed that, in my character of American, of republican, I might dispense with all ceremony. The Prince treated me as kindly as did the Princess, and I was allowed to work as long and as quietly as in my own studio, taking my meals at the royal table when I chose or having them served in my painting-room. Both husband and wife would come in familiarly now and again to see how I was getting along and sit down to have a little talk. On one occasion I remember that the Princess, who was generosity itself, who was always giving and had innumerable protégés, showed me her purse, which seemed very empty, saying: "Is'nt it flat, Mr. Healy? My poor purse—it is its normal condition!"

Once again I was to see Roumania. It was in 1881. I had gone to America, as I was in the habit of doing every few years, and was at work in Chicago. A despatch from the Princess of Roumania reached me at a moment when several portraits were already begun. The Prince had been named colonel of a Prussian regiment, and of an Austrian one also. The rule in such a case is for the royal colonel to send his portrait to his new regiment—which is a platonic way of commanding it. I was requested to paint both. I excused myself to my Chicago friends, promised to return soon, and the next Saturday found me a passenger on a trans-Atlantic steamer. It was during this visit to Bucharest that the Prince and Princess became King and Queen. One day, while I was at work, the chamberlain came to request my presence near my royal hosts. I found them in the throne room. The Prince was evidently full of emotion and so was his wife. All the members of the Chambers were introduced. They had just voted the new dignity, and came in a body to proclaim the result of the vote. It was a very simple ceremony: the delegates were in their ordinary clothes, and passed in order before their sovereigns. The King's hand, which held his written address, trembled visibly.

But though my sitters were now "Majesties," our relations remained as charming as ever, and it seemed to me that both, however flattered and pleased they might be, half regretted the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old title. When I took leave of my hosts, it was with a sad and heavy heart, as though this parting were likely to be the last. I have not seen them since.

During my stay in Rome I painted from memory a portrait of Pope Pius IX. His Holiness, having seen this unfinished work, liked it, and consented to give me a few sittings. This was a great favor, which I highly appreciated. So far I had only seen the Pope, with other strangers, at the Vatican receptions, or from afar when he officiated at St. Peter's, before the events of 1870.

I was introduced, one morning, into Pius IX.'s library; a pleasant room, simply enough furnished, full of books, the table covered with papers. The Pope was dressed all in white cloth, with scarlet shoes; the hair was white, the face rather pale, with very bright eyes, not incapable of sparkle, for His Holiness knew how to take a joke. He was a pretty good sitter, but somewhat restless, and curious also as to what his painter was about. On one occasion he arose from his seat to look over my shoulder. When I am earnestly at work, I wish my sitters to help me, and do their duty by remaining in the attitude I have chosen. I exclaimed, perhaps a little abruptly: "I beg your Holiness to sit down." The Pope laughed and said: "I am accustomed to give orders, not to receive them. But you see, Mr. Healy, that I also know how to obey," and submissively went back to his chair.

Pius IX. has been dead now many a year. I like to think of the few short sittings he gave me in his cheerful library; I like to remember his quiet, pleasant talk, his rather Italian-sounding French, his judgments of men and things. One day, speaking of a monk who had left the church and married, he observed, not without malice: "He has taken his punishment in his own hands." I like especially to feel as though the hours spent in his presence had cast a glow on my later years, as the glorious setting sun behind St. Peter's throws a glamour over Rome, its domes and gardens. I often think, also, of Pius IX.'s gentle reproach to one of my countrymen who, in his American pride, refused to bend before him: "My son, an old man's blessing never did harm to any one."

GEORGE P. A. HEALY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES.

BY ANDREW D. WHITE, LL.D., EX-PRESIDENT OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

A LATE report of the Bureau of Education at Washington shows in the United States nearly four hundred institutions claiming to do university work.

Two questions immediately suggest themselves. First, that which Principal Tulloch, of the University of St. Andrew's, once asked a metropolitan audience: "If, as all of us in Scotland well know, our four universities are certainly two, and possibly three, more than Scotland needs, what can you do with twenty-two universities in the State of New York?" This question is supplemented by another: If Germany acknowledges that its twenty-one universities are more than it needs, what use can the United States have for these four hundred?

The simple fact is that the report of the Bureau of Education, while it shows that we come far short of a proper provision for public instruction as a whole, shows that this mass of teaching and learning bodies is as yet mainly in chaos and awaiting the evolution of something better.

The slightest comparison between returns made by various institutions to the bureau will prove this. While at one end of the system we have institutions like Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, the universities of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and others bearing the names of States, with Johns Hopkins, Cornell, and Tulane, each of them, as a rule, expending several hundred thousand dollars a year, and each showing that it cannot meet the demands upon it even with these great sums, we have at the other end, and, indeed, throughout the greater part of the mass, institutions claiming to do university work with an entire invested endowment less than the smallest of the sums annually used by either of the institutions above named. One little fact

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occurs to the present writer as significant of many. In the budget of Cornell University for the present year are two pieces of apparatus for the department of physics, either of which demands a larger outlay than the entire income of almost any "university" in the State.

It is evident that there is error or deception somewhere: it is not necessary to suppose intentional fraud; doubtless the mistaken estimates are in most, if not in all, cases due to local or sectarian hope, zeal, and misunderstanding.

The question is: How out of this chaos, which really cripples the higher American education and tends to bring ridicule upon it at home and abroad, can be evolved a better system, one adjusted to the various needs of the country — a system in which names of institutions correspond to facts and their work to public needs? To this question I will, as briefly as possible, endeavor to suggest an answer.

A well-adjusted system of instruction in any constitutionally-governed country embraces three parts: First, a general public-school system, in which are taught those fundamental branches necessary to a citizen and preparatory to all higher education; secondly, an intermediate-college system, for those whose aims and tastes carry them beyond the sphere of the public schools; thirdly, universities and special training-schools for the highest general, professional, and technical instruction.

It is evident that the present so-called university system of the United States is a muddle of institutions devoted to these last two sorts of work,—a jumble of institutions which ought to be colleges with institutions which ought to be universities.

The results of this chaos are unfortunate in many ways.

First, there is great financial waste in the duplication of work, universities giving collegiate instruction and colleges trying to give university instruction.

Secondly, there is great waste of effort. The smaller institutions, not having funds necessary to subdivide departments, are forced to confide several distinct departments to a single individual: the result is that the professor is overworked and the instruction is bad.

Thirdly, there is moral waste. These smaller institutions, competing with the larger, have frequently to resort to means more or less at the expense of the manly self-respect of their presidents,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

professors, and teachers, to say nothing of their conceptions of morals. In the Western States, especially, the war waged by petty sectarian colleges against the noble State universities has been monstrous and ridiculous. In order to keep up its small number of students, each of these denominational colleges, from the pulpits of its sect, endeavors to play upon the prejudices or fears of church members, and so to wheedle or scare them into keeping their sons and daughters out of the State universities, and into placing them in these small, insufficiently-equipped denominational institutions. The grossest misrepresentations have been frequent. More than once synods and conferences have been moved to pass resolutions denouncing these larger institutions; more than once presidents of such universities, and this not only in Western, but in Eastern, States,—men deeply religious,—have been denounced by the agents of the smaller colleges in various sectarian pulpits as "atheists," and their universities have been represented to be "hot-beds of infidelity." This sort of warfare is, indeed, outworn, and is evidently less and less profitable to those who wage it; but while it is doing less and less injury to the larger institutions, it certainly must do much moral damage to those representatives of the small colleges who feel forced to resort to it.

Finally, there is great intellectual waste. In almost all these small colleges are many admirable men, both among the professors and the students; but the professors, owing to insufficient endowments, are frequently obliged to do their work without proper means of illustration, and to waste their efforts upon such a number of subjects that they can do nothing well, so that they become prematurely jaded and discouraged. As to the students, they are frequently graduated from such colleges with a training greatly inferior to that which they suppose they are receiving, and find too late that they have been misled.

While it may be acknowledged that in very many of these colleges the instruction in mathematics, except the highest, and in Greek and Latin books ordinarily read, is thoroughly good and conscientious, it is certain that there is a woful want of proper instruction in most other departments. Men are constantly graduated from them with no knowledge of the best thought in philosophy, science, history, political economy, or literature. So that when they attempt to address the public in the pulpit, on the platform, in the professor's chair, or through the press, they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

find themselves completely beaten at every turn by those who have been trained to know what the men of light and leading in various departments are thinking of *now*. Especially is this the case in the pulpit. Few sights are more pitiable than a noble, devoted clergyman, trained in systems of philosophy long since antiquated, preaching to men who have read the leading works of leading thinkers in history, philosophy, or science.

Hardly less unfortunate is the effect on the comparatively small number of institutions so largely endowed as to be entitled provisionally to the name of universities. They are obliged to waste a large share of their endowment and effort in simply duplicating the work which the great mass of colleges ought to do, and might do. These universities are burdened by large freshman and sophomore classes, embracing frequently hundreds of young men, in lower mathematics, in Greek and Latin which ought to be preparatory, and in modern languages much below the point which ought to be reached by a university student. Here, too, is great waste—a duplication of work just as unfortunate as that in the colleges.

Nothing can be more simple than the evolution process which would take both these classes of institutions out of this present chaos.

In the first place, there would be a differentiation : the more feebly-endowed institutions, forming the great majority of those now professing to do university work, would become simply and frankly intermediate colleges, and they would thus meet what is, perhaps, the greatest want of the country to-day—a system of intermediate institutions forming the connecting link between the public-school system and the university system ; discharging the duties accomplished in Germany by the gymnasia, and in England by such colleges as Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Winchester, and the like.

How can this transition from the present chaos to a well-ordered separation between the colleges and universities, in which each shall discharge its appropriate function, be best accomplished ? Apart from questions of pride or vanity, which I shall treat later, the evolution of this better system would seem to be easy.

Let institutions of small endowment, whether called colleges or universities, frankly take their rightful position ; let them stop claiming to do work which their authorities know well that they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot accomplish in competition with the largely-endowed universities. Let them accept the situation, and begin with their freshman year two years earlier than the present freshman year at most of the better colleges—that is, let them put their roots down into the great public-school system of the country, and draw directly and copiously from it. A course of instruction thus formed would begin with the beginning of the higher arithmetic, algebra, geometry, the principal modern languages, the elements of the natural sciences, and, for those who wish to study them, one or more of the ancient languages. Next, let this course in the intermediate college be continued up to the point which is at present reached, as a rule, in our colleges and universities of a good grade at the beginning of the junior year. After its four years' work, let the college bestow its diplomas or certificates upon its graduating classes, and then let those who desire it be admitted into the universities upon the presentation of these certificates and diplomas.

Next, as to the universities. In these let there be courses of advanced study, general, professional, or technical, covering, we will say, three years, and graduating men into the various professions.

Should this system be evolved, the United States will have a system of instruction as good as any in the world; indeed, in some respects better than any other in the world.

As to the intermediate colleges, the earliest effect upon them would be to give them a far larger number of students than they have now, and, therefore, more ample means and a far stronger hold upon the community. Those great freshman and sophomore classes which swarm in upon Harvard, Yale, Princeton, the University of Michigan, Cornell, and other large universities, would be divided among these intermediate colleges, for under the proposed system students could not, as a rule, enter the larger universities save through the intermediate colleges.

These intermediate colleges would thus be called to do the work which they can do thoroughly well. They would have no need of great laboratories, or extensive libraries, or complicated collections, or rooms equipped for "seminary" instruction: they would be training-colleges, their main need being good professors, moderate libraries, simple illustrative apparatus, and such collections as are needed for the instruction generally given up to the beginning of the junior year in our colleges.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The position of these intermediate colleges would be immediately raised. Not only would their funds be greatly increased from instruction fees, but connection with them would be far more of an honor than it is at present.

As to the public at large, a great saving in time would be made. Under the present want of system far too much time is taken; the student really throws away two or three of his most precious years. One of the constantly-recurring questions among university professors is: "What can these young men have been doing with their time? They are, at entering college, say, seventeen or eighteen years of age; what have they been doing during the six or seven years since they began preparing for college?"

The simple fact is that they have "*dawdled*," and in doing so they have not only wasted precious time, but—what is still worse—they have injured their powers of application; for a short course pursued energetically is worth far more than a long course pursued listlessly. They have been taught at various intermediate schools, largely by men far inferior to the better grade of professors even in the smallest colleges; they have had not only studies intermediate between the common-school and college, but little messes of various things which they would have obtained far better at college or university;—a little old-fashioned physics and chemistry, geology, and moral philosophy,—generally by text-book recitation,—just enough to "take the edge off" any better instruction they may receive afterward. Hence the student is on the average seventeen or eighteen years of age when he enters college, is graduated at twenty-one or twenty-two, and then takes two or three years more in a professional school, bringing him not infrequently up to his twenty-fifth or twenty sixth year when he goes out into the world.

Under the system proposed in this article, the youth would enter college easily at thirteen or fourteen; he would go on energetically under the better teachers of the collegiate system, be graduated, after four years, at seventeen or eighteen, and, after three years of advanced general, professional, or technical study at the university, he would receive his second degree and go out into the world at twenty or twenty-one years of age.

I am aware that one thing stands greatly in the way of such a consummation, and that is the pride of those at present interested in the smaller colleges.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even the smallest of those which are at present called universities are naturally reluctant to relinquish that name. They can keep it, if they choose, under the proposed system; but it is a question whether their own good sense will not show them, even more clearly than it must show them now, how ludicrously absurd it is, close at the beginning of the twentieth century, in presence of this nation of sixty million people, for an institution to call itself a university which cannot possibly do university work.

Next, of course, comes as an obstacle the pride of the alumni of such institutions. Many of them would doubtless oppose a change which would seem to lower their standing from that of university graduates to that of graduates from an intermediate college. There are two ways of meeting this difficulty, if it be found really serious. One is to let the intermediate colleges continue to graduate their students with the degree of bachelor, and let the universities only confer higher degrees. Another way, which has been tried with good effect in at least one case in this country, would be for the universities to adopt the graduates of neighboring colleges at the time of the transition, considering their degrees equivalent to similar degrees granted by the university, and holding those bearing them as university alumni.

Still another, and perhaps a more serious, difficulty lies in the natural pride of the presidents and professors of these small colleges. It is in human nature that men should desire to hold their positions as at present; but, after all, a man calling himself a "chancellor," or even a president, of a "university" which really has only means sufficient for an ordinary preparatory school, which has but a handful of professors and students, with a library, apparatus, and collections hardly sufficient for a primary school, has no very great reason to congratulate himself on any large amount of glory afforded by his title. He would be far more highly respected by himself, by his students, and by the community at large, if he were the president of an intermediate college doing thoroughly what it pretends to do, and not nominally doing university work for which it has few applicants and no equipment.

Indeed, it is an open question whether the presidency of such an intermediate institution would not be considered fully equal to any position in any university. The state of things in England and Germany, as well as some facts in our own history, seems to throw an encouraging light upon the question. It is a well-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known fact that the heads of such English intermediate colleges as Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Marlborough, and the like, really hold a more important position in the commuuity, as a rule, than do any of the resident university anthorities, as such, at Oxford, Cambridge, or Durham. This is easily shown by the fact that the highest places in the English Church are, generally speaking, more frequently given to men who have proved administrative abilities in these intermediate colleges than to those who have merely shown high scholarship in the university faculties. The present Archbishop of Canterbury and the greater number of his recent predecessors have been chosen from among the heads of the intermediate colleges. The same thing is true in regard to the present Bishop of London and to a number of other bishops, as also in regard to very many in other high ecclesiastical positions: of these a type is the present Dean of Westminster, who, though he passed through the headship of a college at Oxford, secured his original reputation as head of one of the intermediate colleges. It would be hard to find men more honored or of wider influence than such heads of public schools as Busby, Hawtrey, and Arnold.

The same thing meets us in Germany: few professors in the universities, as such, stand as high before the public at large as do sundry heads of gymnasia. In the history of the higher education in Germany there is hardly a university professor who, so far as general influence on education is concerned, takes as high rank as Sturm, who was simply the head of a gymnasium. Any one at all familiar with German life knows that the rector of a gymnasium is, in any city, a man of mark by virtue of his position, and is quite as widely honored as is the average professor, or even rector, of any university.

Intermediate instruction in the United States reveals the same fact. How vastly inferior is the usual position of a great majority of university or college presidents to that of such heads of American gymnasia as Taylor at Andover, Hawley Olmsted at New Haven, Bancroft at Exeter, Coit at Concord, Dimock and Everett at Quincy, Andrews at Cazenovia, and a great number of others who could be named!

Finally, there would come to the intermediate colleges a new incentive to the very best work. At present, if a professor in a small college does thoroughly well, the greater universities rarely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hear of him, for there is no connection between the two classes of institutions. But under the system proposed students at the various intermediate colleges would bear straightway to the universities the reputation of the best teachers they had known. In this way men who do thorough work in the intermediate colleges would be virtually sure of advancement to positions in the universities, to the great good of both parts of the system.

Nor would the universities be less fortunate: they would be enabled to use their endowments, not in duplicating work done by the intermediate colleges, not in providing professors and teachers for students in preparatory branches, but in securing the very highest class of professors and lecturers, the most complete collections of books, apparatus, and general equipment, the most extensive facilities for investigation, research, and advancement into new realms of knowledge: in fact, they would be enabled to do what universities ought to do—they would lead young men thoroughly trained at the intermediate colleges into higher fields, and be prepared so to concentrate their resources on these higher fields that they would do far more both for instruction and for the extension of knowledge than they can ever hope to do under the present condition of things.

What, then, would be the shape taken by such a system?

First, the great mass of public schools would be greatly improved by having better and better teachers under the plan suggested.

Secondly, there would be several hundred intermediate colleges, varying considerably, indeed, in endowment and strength, but each growing stronger and stronger, because doing legitimate work and because the public would soon find out how important this work really is as compared with the work which such colleges are pretending to do at present.

Thirdly, there would be the real universities—possibly as many as twenty or thirty. It may be thought invidious to name the institutions likely to take this rank, but every man at all acquainted with the higher education of the United States can easily indicate those most likely to have the means of carrying on advanced university work. This category would embrace the stronger of the old colleges and universities, several of the State universities, and a certain number of the newer institutions which in the last quarter of a century have received large endowments. This number would be increased, as time goes on,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the stronger colleges here and there rising into the ranks of real universities, or occasionally by the munificence of some man rich enough, patriotic enough, and far-seeing enough to give the seven or eight millions of dollars necessary to found a university.

Of course this system cannot be forced or argued into existence at once. It is evidently coming by a process of evolution; but what I would urge is that more and more those in positions to influence this evolution should do what they can to prepare the public mind for it by aiding right reason and by giving proper direction to educational effort.

To this end it is to be hoped that wealthy men wishing to aid the lesser institutions may endow work to which such institutions are suited, and not add here and there excrescences to enable them to do work for which they are unfitted. For example, the gift of a great observatory or laboratory, worthy of a university, to a little, feebly-endowed college, while it is not, perhaps, money utterly thrown away, is generally money wofully misapplied; far better to give to such institutions money for professorships, instructorships, scholarships, and buildings.

So, too, it is to be hoped that more and more the authorities of the lesser colleges, seeing that the competition with the greater universities is becoming more and more hopeless, will turn their attention to the sort of work which can best be done by intermediate colleges, and, by doing it thoroughly well, attract large numbers of students, and so make a far more useful impression upon the country than they can hope to do by spreading their efforts not only over their own legitimate field, but over that of the universities.

And, finally, it is to be hoped that the universities, with their larger endowments, may, by constantly raising the standards of admission, require candidates for entrance to remain longer in the intermediate schools, thus aiding to develop these into intermediate colleges. As an example of a step toward this, the action recently proposed at Harvard University merits thoughtful attention, and it would be well if each of the greater and stronger universities would make preparations for giving over to intermediate colleges, first, its freshman class, and, next, its sophomore class, within the coming eight or ten years.

ANDREW D. WHITE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOR TENDENCIES IN GREAT BRITAIN.

BY MICHAEL DAVITT.

EVENTS of much import to the political future of the British working classes have made themselves felt during this month of May. They will have been more or less referred to in the cable chronicles which keep the public of the United States informed of the diurnal history of Europe. Among these events were the publication of the fifth and last report of the committee of the House of Lords on "sweating" in the workshops of Great Britain, chiefly of London; Mr. Gladstone's article in *Lloyd's Newspaper* upon the rights and responsibilities of labor; and the rapid growth of British labor organizations as manifested in the popular demonstrations in Hyde Park and other parts of England on the 4th of the month in support of the eight-hours movement. It is doubtful if even the resourceful press of America can have given to these occurrences the full attention which would be essential to a correct study of their meaning. It has occurred to me, therefore, that it might not be out of place if a subject of such vast importance, not alone to British, but to international, labor interests, were discussed in some detail in the columns of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. The economic relations between the two great English-speaking parts of the industrial world render it necessary that thinking men and politicians on both sides of the Atlantic should comprehend the full meaning of the movements peculiar to both continents.

The scandalous—the almost inhuman—conditions under which working men and women are being employed in many industries in England have long been the subject of a bitter cry for redress. Public feeling has been appealed to from time to time in recent years to have this matter fully investigated, and in consequence of this agitation a Select Committee of the House of Lords was appointed last year to take evidence. It may possi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bly excite a smile among your readers to find members of the aristocratic chamber voting themselves a task of this kind. A committee of *gourmands* resolving to investigate the quality of the food served out to the inmates of a poorhouse would about correspond, in the matter of propriety, with a committee of the House of Lords inquiring into the conditions and pay of labor in the workshops of England! However, this is how things are sometimes done in this country. The evidence collected by Lord Dunraven's committee more than confirms the statements that have been made from time to time in the press about the extent and the evils of the "sweating" system. It will hardly be credited by those in America who are not familiar with the conditions of daily toil in many of the English industries to what extent "white slavery" is still prevalent in civilized England. The report of the House of Lords' committee should be carefully read by those in the United States who know to what extent the terms and circumstances of labor in countries commercially related react upon each other's industrial well-being. I can only give a few extracts in this article.

Speaking of the tailoring industry of London, the report says (page 4):

"The conditions under which life is carried on, as described by some witnesses, are deplorable in the extreme. These witnesses have seen people working with the garments on their backs to keep the worker warm; Mr. Monroe knowing of a child with measles being covered by one of these garments. Three or four gas-jets may be flaring in the room, a coke fire burning in the wretched fire-place, sinks untrapped, closets without water, and altogether the sanitary condition abominable. A witness told us that in a double room, perhaps 9 feet by 15 feet, a man, his wife, and six children slept, and in the same room ten men were usually employed, so that at night eighteen persons would be in that one room!"

The wages paid to the unfortunate wretches who are compelled to work under such conditions are particularized as follows (pages 5 and 6):

"The highest rate paid for men's work is 10s. a day. It runs down to 2s. 6d.; women occasionally get 6s. a day, but the average is very low. For a slop coat from 2s. to 3s. 9d. was formerly paid; but the rate now is 1s. 6d. to 2s. 3d. A good coat for which a man got 10s. 2d. a few years ago now brings the maker only 6s. 6d. . . . Mr. Arnold White produced a coat which was made for seven pence halfpenny, and by working fifteen hours a woman could make four such in a day, earning 2s. 6d.; but out of this she had to pay 3d. for getting the buttonholes worked and 4d. for the trimmings."

Continuing, the report goes on to say:

"As regards the men's hours, sometimes they work eighteen, twenty, or even twenty-two hours at a stretch; a witness once worked forty hours, from 6 A. M. on Thursday till 10 P. M. on Friday. A witness went to work the day before appearing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before the committee at 6:30 A. M., and worked until 2:30 A. M. of the following day; one hour for dinner, no tea time; worked harder here than in Warsaw, and made less. A witness stated that he got 5s. per diem when at work; his hours were from 8 A. M. till 11 P. M., and employment very irregular. The Rev. R. C. Billing has seen hands at work at 2 A. M., and has found them again at work at 7 A. M. the same morning."

This state of things does not, of course, prevail in anything like a general rule throughout the tailoring trade of England. It, however, largely obtains in London and other great centres where ready-made clothing is made for exportation. The wearer of a London-made coat in New York may possibly realize the profits of "sweating" on learning that the original cost of his sartorial adornment may have been but fifteen cents!

The report supplies evidence of an almost similar state of things in the "sweating" practices of Glasgow, Edinburgh, Newcastle, Dudley, Shrewsbury, Walsall, Liverpool, Sheffield, Manchester, and Leeds tailoring.

Before entering upon the details of sweating in the boot-making trade, as supplied in evidence, the report gives the following description of how the imported Jews and other pauper work-seekers are victimized upon landing in London. Nothing in the recorded doings of the touts who infested the vicinity of Castle Garden can surpass in villanous heartlessness this account of London rascality, given on page 17 of the report:

"People wait for them at the docks, professing to be able to find them employment, but 'they will not do anything for them until they have robbed them of every sixpence they have.' They 'are in a fearful condition,' said another witness; 'some are without money entirely; others have a few groschen, or marks, or thalers, or roubles, just as the case may be, of which they are very soon eased by the loafers and touts and runners that hang about the docks for the purpose of trying to show them lodgings or a place to rest themselves for the night.' 'They almost stand in the market at the East End after arrival,' the Rector of Spitalfields, now Bishop of Bedford, told us, 'in a miserable plight, with hardly any clothes to cover them, and without a penny in their pockets.' 'I have myself,' he continued, 'seen these poor creatures at work up to two o'clock in the morning, and I have found them again at work, the same people and in the same room, at seven in the morning, working to a large extent just for their own maintenance and their own shelter.'"

According to the best-informed witnesses who were examined before the committee, "sweating" is carried on to a greater extent in the boot trade than in any other industry in London. The most destitute of the foreign Jews coming to England are pressed through their wretched condition into the service of the sweaters, and it is computed that no less than 5,000 "greeners," as these inexperienced workmen are called, are now employed in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the boot manufactories of London alone. At page 20 the report supplies this information :

"Some of the masters, it is said, hold their men under a contract for a certain period, and a sum of money is deducted weekly from their wages as a deposit, which they forfeit if they leave the firm or master who has engaged them, and thus are prevented from obtaining higher wages during the busy period of the year when their labor is in most demand."

Summing up the evidence given about the boot trade, the committee trace the "sweating" practices to a variety of causes. They say at pages 21 and 22 :

"It will be seen from the foregoing epitome of the evidence that sweating in the boot trade is mainly traced by the witnesses to the introduction of machinery and a more complete system of sub-division of labor, coupled with immigration from abroad and foreign competition. Some witnesses have traced it in a great measure, if not principally, to the action of factors; some to excessive competition among small masters as well as men; others have accused the trades-unions of a course of action which has defeated the end they have in view, namely, effectual combination, by driving work, owing to their arbitrary conduct, out of the factory into the house of the worker, and of handicapping England in the race with foreign countries by setting their faces against the use of the best machinery. The lack of technical education has also been deplored. Mr. Arnold White and Mr. Miers repudiated the contention that the demand for cheapness is the cause of sweating—a contention which, as regards upholstery, was energetically put forward by Mr. Holland. Mr. Miers, on the contrary, held 'that the sweating system puts before the public the cheap articles, and that it is not the public that particularly calls for them.'"

Going from London to the midland counties, the report deals with the chain- and nail-making industries. The conditions of employment and pay are thus described :

"The business is carried on in this way : the worker receives a certain weight of iron, and he has to return a corresponding weight of chain, less an allowance which is, or ought to be, four pounds in the bundle weighing half a hundredweight, for waste in the working. It is stated that workmen can occasionally save some iron out of the allowance for waste, which they work up on their own account, and sell to 'foggers' (the local name for sweaters) at low rates, to the general detriment of the trade. One of the most common charges, however, brought by the workers is that the necessary weight for waste is not allowed them, and consequently they are unable to return the requisite weight of chain."

Instances are next given of the enormous profits made by middlemen out of the underpaid labor of men and women, and the report proceeds :

"A still more extraordinary case is that mentioned by Mr. Juggins, who stated that cart chains costing, as far as value of labor and material were concerned, three halfpence and 7d. respectively, had been sold in Southport for from 4s. 6d. to 5s., in Liverpool for 5s., and in London for 7s. A male chain-maker stated that he earned 14s. or 15s. a week, working from seven to seven, except on Mondays, when he finished at six and Saturdays at three. A nail-maker said that out of his week's work only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about 8s. 6d. remained for himself, after deducting firing and other charges; 'and I have worked for that amount of money,' he added, 'till I do not know where to put myself.' In another case a husband and wife work together; there are three children, two at school and none at work. The man does the 'heading,' the woman the 'pointing,' of the nails. Their united work brings in from 18s. to £1 a week; out of that about 2s. 3d. for a 'breeze,' about 5s. for carriage, 2s. 6d. for rent of house and shop; schooling of the children, 6d.; 6d. to 9d. for deductions on account of underweight, and the man has to devote half a day to a day to repairing his tools. Eighteen shillings or £1 does not represent their average weekly earnings over a year, as some weeks they do not get any work at all. Their general hours of work were from seven in the morning till nine at night, with half an hour for breakfast, an hour for dinner, and half an hour for tea for the man."

It would be expected, in the natural course of things, that a committee who had laid bare so shocking a state of industrial life in England would have remedies to recommend equal to the evils which their efforts have brought to light and localized. But we search in vain through the pages of their report for any courageous or efficient proposal. The few suggestions that are put forward are not worthy of being called a remedy, while Lord Dunraven and his colleagues dismiss the whole subject in a sermonizing paragraph which truly gauges their capacity for the task imposed upon them.

"We cannot conclude," say their lordships at page 24, "without expressing our earnest hope that the exposure of the evils which have been brought to our notice will induce capitalists to pay closer attention to the conditions under which the labor which supplies them with goods is conducted. When legislation has reached the limit up to which it is effective, the real amelioration of conditions must be due to increased sense of responsibility in the employer and improved habits in the employed. We have reason to think that the present inquiry itself has not been without moral effect. And we believe that public attention and public judgment can effectually check operations in which little regard is shown to the welfare of workpeople and to the quality of production, and can also strongly second the zealous and judicious efforts now being made to encourage thrift, promote temperance, improve dwellings, and raise the tone of living."

This being all which the second chamber of the British Parliament is prepared to recommend for the alleviation of the worst kind of labor evils in the large centres of manufacturing life, it is matter of no surprise to find a rapid spread of socialistic ideas among the toilers of all callings who are taught to rely upon combination and public opinion as the surest means by which effective remedies can be obtained. The House of Commons even, the "popular chamber," as it is called in England, is getting out of touch with the working classes. It was significant that, though there were nearly half a million of London citizens in Hyde Park taking part in the eight-hours demonstration on the fourth of May, there was but one Member of Parliament among the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speakers, and he was a pronounced Socialist. It is not to be inferred from this that socialistic doctrines are converting all English workingmen away from the more conservative ideas of trades-unionism; but it is one among many signs indicating the progress of principles of social reform which appeal to the minds and the hopes of, at least, the unskilled laborers of Great Britain far more strongly than do the old methods of purely Parliamentary redress. We are, therefore, about to witness in England and Scotland a movement of extra-Parliamentary political action which will seek to combine all workers in something like a federated organization for the vindication of labor rights. It bids fair to discard the questionable aid of both Liberal and Tory politicians, unless the former party advances its position considerably nearer to the programme of the labor movement than it occupies at present.

Mr. Gladstone, always mindful and watchful of the current of popular tendencies, but never willing to turn it in the direction of concrete action until public opinion sets a political value upon the lead which must be taken by some one, has just discussed the labor problem in his usual masterly style. His article in *Lloyd's Newspaper* has, as a matter of course, attracted widespread attention. It is not a pronouncement of policy or an exposition of principle on the labor question so much as a strong, earnest sermon, which is to be read between the lines, of what friendly critics call his pious opinions upon the problem of the hour. While the great Liberal statesman points out the preponderating political power of the working classes in the matter of the franchise, he hopes and prays that such power may never be exercised to the political or other injury of vested interests. He says:

"Were the domestic relation in which employers once stood to laborers to be inverted, and were laborers once to obtain the uncontrolled hand, then, indeed, while the material condition might be higher, they would be subject to a strain of moral trial such as they never yet have been called upon to undergo, and such as only the strong restraints of the Gospel could (in my judgment) enable them successfully to encounter. But such a contingency, though it may be possible, is indefinitely remote. It is most unlikely to arise; and the experience of the United States, which has gone the nearest to trying the question, witnesses to that unlikelihood; for there public right has been developed to the uttermost by public law and by the tone of manners."

Mr. Gladstone with his usual prophetic ken must see clearly, notwithstanding the illustration here given, that political power and supremacy will come into the hands of the working classes of Great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain under totally different conditions to those which he has referred to in the analogy of America. Here government has been and still is carried on by capitalism and aristocracy, to the exclusion of all democratic participation; whereas in the United States the principle of democracy has always guided the destinies of the Republic. The conflict which must take place between the power of the people and the dying influence of the aristocracy for supremacy in the government of the British Empire will have results which Mr. Gladstone foresees as clearly as any man alive, but which he is anxious to disguise from the observation of the present by the expression of pious hopes that this conflict may be indefinitely, if not entirely, postponed.

A consideration of some facts relating to the growing power of labor organization in Great Britain will show that such a conflict is sooner or later inevitable, and may be precipitated by any untoward event.

The most powerful and the best-organized body among the British workers is the coal-miners' organization. It is computed that there are at least 500,000 men employed in the mines of England, Scotland, and Wales; 300,000 of these are organized. Each coal district has its local organization, while most of these local bodies are united in one federated combination.

There are five members directly representing the miners' organizations in Parliament, to whom salaries are paid averaging $1,700 a year. These are Thomas Burt, M. P., for the Morpeth division of Northumberland; Charles Fenwick, M. P., for the Wandsbeck division of the same county; William Crawford, M. P., for Mid-Durham; Benjamin Pickard, M. P., for the Normanton division of Yorkshire, and William Abraham, M. P., for the Rhondda Valley, in Wales.

These Parliamentary representatives of the miners of Great Britain are men of more than average ability, both as public speakers and organizers of men. They are of irreproachable public character and command considerable influence in the House of Commons. They are not advocates of advanced theories of social reform, and are considered, in many respects, far too conservative by the more radical element in the rank and file of the great miners' organizations.

The miners of the county of Durham are accounted to be the best equipped in funds of all the separate miners' organizations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They have accumulated a large amount of capital and have been able to exercise so much power and political influence in Durham as to compel the mine-owners to concede to them practically all they have demanded. Their hours of daily labor are seven from "bank to bank." Their wages average about eleven dollars a week, but they only work eleven days in the fortnight. The hours of labor and wages vary in other counties, Durham being more favored than other districts in this respect. In Staffordshire the hours of daily toil are between ten and eleven, but in this midland county the miners are badly organized; which accounts for their backward position in the matter of pay and hours of labor. In Derbyshire a similar condition of things prevails, while Yorkshire, on the other hand, approximates more to the state of pay and work which obtains in Durham. In Scotland the miners work, on the average, nine and a half hours per diem. Lanarkshire is the chief mining county of Scotland. Until recently organization was very backward among the Lanark miners, who are even still far from being as well paid, or as well able to take care of themselves in other respects, as the Durham miners.

The immense power wielded by these mining bodies was significantly illustrated a few weeks ago, when a united demand on the part of the miners of England was made for an advance of 10 per cent. in their wages. It was believed for a time that the mine-owners, who have been compelled in recent years to grant many concessions of a similar kind, would refuse to have this latest demand added to the number. Pending the notice given by the miners' representatives, the public were apprehensive of a fuel famine as the result of the contest between employers and employed. However, on the expiration of the time embraced in the miners' notice, the 10 per cent. increase of wages was granted, and another triumph was added to the long list of victories which organization has won for the most deserving section of the workers of Great Britain.

It is impossible to say what the organized miners of Great Britain may not be able to obtain for themselves and their cause if they continue to press their full demands upon the consideration of the capitalist owners of British mines. England without her coal would be like Samson without his locks,—weak and powerless, commercially as well as politically. And should a leader arise from among the mining population of Great Britain who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would resolve upon striking a deadly blow at landlordism in mines, in order to win for coal-miners the value of the full output of their daily work as their daily wage, he could practically paralyze for a time the whole industrial life of Great Britain if his demands were not conceded. Whether or not such a contingency will occur is a somewhat hazardous subject to speculate upon; but if we are to judge of the probabilities of the near future by the growing power, intelligence, and political influence of labor organizations all over these three countries at the present time, such an event as that hinted at may possibly be embraced among the means which workingmen may be driven to resort to in order to enforce their claims to a just remuneration for the risk and toil of their daily labor.

There is no need in an article of this kind to dwell at any length upon the trades-unions of Great Britain. They have achieved a world-wide reputation by the steady and progressive improvement which they have effected in the conditions of the work and pay of their members. Moreover, the history of these bodies is sufficiently well known already in the United States. Several of their leaders have visited America from time to time, and have explained in speeches or through the press the character and scope and the ultimate objects of their organizations. Here in England the trades-unions are now considered to be too conservative in their policy. Trades-union leaders are referred to frequently by the leaders of the unskilled working classes as "the aristocrats of labor." Mr. Henry Broadhurst, M. P., the recognized head of English trades-unionism, is frequently singled out for attack by John Burns and Tom Mann, who are the most typical men among the daily-increasing number of labor agitators in England. Mr. Broadhurst was Under-Secretary of State in the Liberal government in 1886, and it is said against him by his more advanced [illegible] that he is more of a thick-and-thin supporter of the Liberal party than a leader of English workingmen.

It is certain that we shall witness a severe struggle in the near future between the new labor leaders and the old. John Burns is coming rapidly to the front as a prominent leader of the new labor forces. He is a man of striking individuality and great force of character. He has succeeded in giving himself a good education, and is in every way qualified to act well the part which public opinion assigns to him in the present movement. The signal success

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which he, in conjunction with Tom Mann, achieved in the great dock-laborers' strike of London, the admirable tact and judgment which distinguished his action in counselling, directing, and restraining 30,000 or 40,000 workingmen who had never before been disciplined into any united effort, have won for him a world-wide reputation. He commands the full confidence of a very large section of the labor population of London, from having labored for years among their poorest working classes before his efforts on their behalf were recognized by the approbation of the general public. He is one of the most efficient members of the London County Council, and is at present a candidate for the representation of the borough of Battersea in the Imperial Parliament. Many of the best judges of public men are predicting a big future for Burns. It remains, however, to be seen whether a successful labor agitator can also become a successful politician. Burns is a good and forcible speaker, is well informed upon most topics of current interest, and, like most other labor leaders of these countries, is a total abstainer.

Burns's programme is not easily defined. He started out, in company with Mr. Hyndman, of the Social Democratic Federation, as a revolutionary Social Democrat, favoring the nationalization of the machinery of production as well as of the land. In those days he inclined to the means of revolutionary effort rather than the methods of constitutional action ; but since his achievements in the dock strike have brought him more prominently before the public as a more or less responsible leader, he has modified his programme and has wisely discarded all appeals to ph ysical revolution. This rational change of policy has strengthened his position with the public opinion of London. It is folly to preach an appeal to the sword for the redress of labor rights in a country where the working classes can, if they choose to organize themselves for the purpose, effect a constitutional revolution by means of the ballot-box. As Mr. Gladstone has said in the article to which I have already referred, "The ultimate power resides in the hands of those who constitute our Democracy," and all that remains for whoever shall step into the position of a national leader of the working classes of Great Britain to do is to organize the laboring masses so as to force Parliament, by the legitimate pressure of combination and public opinion, to carry out the mandate of the people who elect the House of Commons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the probable achievement of this constitutional revolution the Irish movement will continue to work on parallel lines with the labor movements of Great Britain. The Land League was more democratic in its principles and aims than English popular movements of the past have been. For it is an anomaly, as Mr. Gladstone points out, that, while political power now practically rests with the working classes in Great Britain, yet its institutions are decidedly anti-democratic. As the great Liberal leader further remarks, "Their basis is popular, but upon that basis is built a hierarchy of classes and of establishments savoring in part of feudal times and principles." Mr. Gladstone, however, is reasoning from the analogy of the recent past, and not from the manifest indications of the present. English popular opinion has been greatly influenced by the principles and teachings of the Land League propaganda of the past few years. And as Ireland has largely received the democratic impulse from her close and constant relations with America, the reaction of the Irish movement upon the English one is infusing the ideas of American democracy among the masses of the British people. We shall therefore witness, in the growing great labor movement of the near future, the cause of social reform running in democratic grooves toward the attainment of its ends. English institutions will undoubtedly become revolutionized as a result of the present uprising of the working classes for higher pay and better conditions of social existence.

A mighty organization is rapidly forming itself in the seaport towns of the three countries. It is partly the result of the successful dock-laborers' strike of London. In London it is called the Dock-Laborers' Union, and has Tom Mann as president. In other large ports it is known as the National Union of Dock-Laborers, with a headquarters in Glasgow. These two bodies number already close upon one hundred thousand members. Wherever the National Union has its branches established, so as to embrace all the dock-laborers of the place in its membership, it practically dictates the rate of pay and the conditions of labor. During the last three months remarkable evidence of its widespread power has been frequently given. A shipping line refusing to grant the demands of the union, say in Glasgow, would have a "boycott" declared against the unloading of a vessel belonging to it in another port; and instances have frequently

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occurred where a ship of a boycotted line had to go from port to port of the three countries in hopeless efforts to have its cargo discharged.

The influence of this dock-laborers' organization may possibly extend even beyond the shores of Great Britain and Ireland. The close commercial and mercantile relations between America and these islands suggest the possibility of a "boycott" in Liverpool being extended to New York. During the recent dock-laborers' strike in Liverpool it was more than once hinted by the leaders that, if the struggle were prolonged on the part of the ship-owners, the quay-laborers of Liverpool might be driven to ask the men employed in similar labor in New York to boycott the ships of the great trans-Atlantic lines owned by such companies as were most determined in opposition to the Liverpool dockers' demands. How far international coöperation of this kind may be resorted to, or be made possible, by the growing feeling of international brotherhood among the workers of the world, is perhaps for the present too much a mere speculation. If, however, we are to judge of the growth of responsive friendly feeling among American workingmen towards the working classes in England by the establishment in Great Britain and Ireland of branches of a great American labor organization, the possibility I speak of may be, and probably is, near. Assemblies of the Knights of Labor are increasing day by day in these islands; which means, presumably, that the workingmen enrolled in such branches can be more or less influenced in their strike policies by the orders of General Master-Workman Powderly. We can only picture, on the other hand, the National Union of Dock-Laborers of Great Britain forming its branches in New York and other ports on the Atlantic seaboard, to recognize the conditions which would enable the leaders of the dockers on this side of the Atlantic to give effect to their policy even in the United States.

The next of the three great British combinations of workers which is deserving of mention here is the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. Its membership extends to the railways of the three countries. The strike which occurred in Ireland lately, and which during seven days practically paralyzed the entire freight traffic of the south of Ireland, was controlled by an English organization. The employees declared the strike, but an official of this body was elected to the leadership, and he provided

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the necessary funds. It was demonstrated in this brief struggle between railway directors and their employees that it is in the power of this single organization to suspend the traffic of the entire railway system of Great Britain and Ireland when the members deem it necessary to do so in furtherance of their interests or claims. This is a fact of portentous importance, not only to railway shareholders, but to the entire capitalistic interests of Great Britain and Ireland as well. It is calculated to materially affect the value of the railway stock of these islands. We shall probably see commercial interests, apart from those of railways, showing a selfish partiality for the cause of the railway employees in future. The latter will have their demands backed up by those whose inclinations would otherwise prompt them to support railway directors, but whose fears of the ultimate consequences of a prolonged strike upon the general trade and commerce of the country will induce them to extend a diplomatic sympathy to the cause of the railway workers.

This brief outline of the wide-reaching influence of three great English organizations will enable those who closely study Mr. Gladstone's recent article to understand why he lays such emphatic stress upon the "responsibilities of labor." We have but to imagine such concerted action between coal-miners, dock-laborers, and railway employees as would enable them, in the enforcement of some demand, to bring the whole manufacturing and transport machinery of Great Britain to a deadlock, to realize the danger which may threaten the interests of British capital at home in the near future. There is as yet no national or federated labor movement in Great Britain. The cause of labor is being fought in independent detachments; one class of workers striking in one part of the country for better pay, while another class, elsewhere, is demanding shorter hours of labor. There is, however, a drawing-together, a tendency to fusion of effort, on the part of the various laboring combinations throughout the country. This is a most hopeful sign of the times. Hitherto there has been little or no coöperation between one class of workers and another, excepting among miners, in the struggle for labor rights. The jealousies that seem inseparable from popular action in a country divided by class distinctions have operated to the injury of the labor cause in general. But here, again, we have to recognize the beneficial influence and teaching

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Irish agitation of the past ten years. In this movement we succeeded practically in combining in one body the various labor interests of Ireland, as an example and a lesson to the cause of our fellow-workers of Great Britain. The solidarity of the Irish movement is powerfully influencing the cohesive action of British labor organizations, and we shall see in a comparatively short time a federation of the labor bodies of Great Britain working out the solution of the problem of British labor as the Land League has worked out that of the Irish land.

The future of the Liberal party will be vitally influenced by the attitude which its responsible leaders must soon take up towards the labor movement. The working classes, as a rule, have hitherto been firm supporters of Mr. Gladstone. They have had many measures of reform passed for them by his successful effort to extend the popular liberties of Englishmen. This is gratefully recognized, and the "G. O. M." is still first favorite among English statesmen with the British toilers. But the allegiance of the workingmen to the Liberal party is bound by no sacred concordat. English, like other workers, are imbibing new ideas of social reform every day, which beget new demands for legislative action for the benefit of the wealth-producers. They have advanced far beyond the party programme of the Liberals, which counts among its leading supporters a good many landlords and a large number of capitalists. The election funds of Mr. Gladstone's party are largely subscribed to by his rich adherents. He is, consequently, bound more or less to interests which act as a restraint upon the progress of his following towards a pronounced radical policy. He has already lost his wealthiest supporters in the home-rule plunge of 1886, and he is naturally anxious to avert the secession of those who still remain by avoiding another new departure.

But while it is impossible not to sympathize with the veteran statesman in this dilemma, he, or, after him, his successor, must either place himself at the head of the labor cohorts now organizing themselves in the struggle for political supremacy in these islands, or "the masses" will create a new party which will shatter the fortunes of the Liberal cause. This latter is the consummation for which the Tories devoutly wish. They are calculating confidently upon a widening breach between the industrial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classes and the Liberal party, securing a return to office of the present government at the next general election. The party tactics of Mr. Gladstone's opponents are adapted to that end. Protection is being dangled in the guise of "fair trade" before workingmen as a panacea for low wages and the other evils of labor competition. Many Tories are even affecting to lean toward state socialism, while it is not improbable that, in the pursuit of this policy, money may be advanced from Tory sources at the next general election with which to run bogus socialist against Liberal candidates.

All this may be discreditable to Tory tactics; but it ought to act as a warning to Liberal statesmen. The working classes have hitherto looked upon the Liberal party as that to which their political affinities naturally attached them. Their votes are now the chief support of that party at elections. Without such support neither Mr. Gladstone nor home rule would stand a ghost of a chance when the next appeal is made to the electorate of Great Britain. Clearly, therefore, it is alike the duty and the interest of the Liberal leaders to advance the lines of their programme so as to embrace the reasonable demands of the labor platform; and if this common-sense step is taken in time, the labor movement and the Liberal cause will run upon parallel lines, in active, sympathetic coöperation, insuring the near achievement of those reforms for which educated workingmen are so earnestly striving, and making the triumph of home rule a political certainty at the next general election.

The cause of labor must be represented in Parliament by a greater number of workingmen than it has there at present. Nine members out of a Parliament of six hundred and seventy are all it possesses now. It lies with the Liberal party to make that nine at least thirty when the next Parliament is elected, and to have state payment of members adopted as a prominent plank in the Liberal programme. To which should be added the municipalization of the land; the abolition of the "breakfast-table duties"; free education for the children of the laboring classes; eight hours as the limit of daily labor in government and municipal employments; better and more sanitary dwellings for the poor; and the rigorous enforcement of the factory acts with respect to the workshops and sweating-dens of the country. A platform with such planks as these would remove all danger of collision at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

electoral polls between labor and Liberal candidates. Such a programme would not comprise all the demands that are now being put forward by the labor leaders, it is true; but it would convince those who "toil and spin" that the Liberal party were resolved to be in touch with them and to make their cause the paramount interest of Parliamentary effort. It would completely counteract the tactics of party disintegration which are now pursued by the Tories, and would secure a *modus vivendi* between the cause of labor and the cause of Liberalism, until the extension of the franchise to universal adult suffrage and the matured results of popular education shall transform the once great Liberal party of England into a party of Industrial Democracy, in whose hands the future destinies of the British Empire will lie for the final mission of good or evil which will remain for it to fulfil in the universal movement for a better and nobler order of civilization among mankind.

MICHAEL DAVITT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FAITH AND CREDULITY.

BY JOHN BURROUGHS.

ONE of our most eminent doctors of divinity, Dr. Fisher, of Yale, has recently been discussing the nature of faith and revelation in one of the popular magazines.

The doctor says that sceptical writers are apt to "describe faith as an arbitrary, groundless acceptance of doctrines in behalf of which no proof is possible. This is to confound faith and credulity." But the doctor does not himself make very clear the difference between the two. If faith goes upon proof, why not call it science? Why is it so difficult? It seems to me that the essence of religious faith is that it is independent of proof, and, at most, rests upon, or starts from, a degree of probability. Faith proper begins where reason ends; where reason avails we have no need of faith: where there is a bridge we do not need to take a leap. What can be proved to the understanding there is no escape from; but our religious cravings and aspirations are entirely personal and subjective, and are not matters of evidence. Religious faith has to do with the supernatural; and what can reason or sense do with that which transcends reason and sense?

Credulity is quite a different thing. Credulity may be defined as belief without proof in matters where proof is demanded and is within reach. Faith is belief without proof in matters where proof is not possible. Mankind have always been very credulous; credulity is easy; we all have to fight against it. But faith, as Dr. Fisher insists, is not easy; it requires a strong effort of the will. Children are very credulous; they believe whatever we tell them without proof. Indeed, they do not yet know what proof is. So with savage tribes, though with them credulity mainly runs into superstition. Credulity is the basis of superstition. When the mysterious, the preternatural, is brought into matters capable of verification, when proof is dispensed with and the event or occurrence is referred to anti-mundane agencies, as in the case of haunted houses, etc., that is superstition.

When Professor Bryce was about to ascend Mount Ararat, he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was told by the people at its base that the ascent was impossible; that no human being would be permitted to behold the top of the sacred mountain. For all that, the plucky traveller thought he would put the matter to the test. He procured guides and set out. His guides failed him long before the summit was reached, but he pushed on alone, and scaled the peak. When he returned and had an interview with one of the religious dignitaries in a village near by, and his guide told the priest that the Englishman had been to the top of Ararat, the priest smiled loftily and said it was impossible—no man had ever been to the top of the mountain. There was superstition—belief in the interference of the supernatural where proof or disproof was easy.

I lately read in the autobiography of the Italian sculptor, Duprè, an incident which affords a similar illustration. Duprè was an excellent man and a great artist, but he was not above superstition, as few of us are. He was driving one day down a steep, rugged mountain road, accompanied by his wife, when he distinctly heard the words, "*Stop, stop!*" As he continued, the words were repeated, and so impressed them both that he did stop and look about him, and called out to his supposed challenger. Seeing and hearing nothing more, he drove on, when "*Stop, stop, stop!*" again rang out from some place near them. Then he again stopped, and, much impressed and even alarmed, he and his wife both got out of the carriage, when he discovered that the linchpin that held one of the hind wheels was gone, and that the wheel was far bent over and just ready to drop off, and thus endanger the lives of the occupants. The pious artist was deeply impressed, and evidently regarded the warning voice as providential. But a little investigation would doubtless have dispelled the delusion. Probably if he had started up his horses after he and his wife left the carriage, he would have discovered the source of the voice in the squeaking wheel. Whenever he had stopped the voice had stopped; the moment he started the cry began.

How full history, especially the religious history of the world, is of such or similar incidents! Credulity underlying religious fear and hope is the basis of them all. In Catholic countries such superstitions thrive luxuriantly. Recently, while some friends of mine were stopping in Madrid, a good deal of excitement was created by a reported miracle that had just happened: the beard of the picture of one of the saints in a certain church

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had grown several inches during the night! Our grandfathers, who nearly all believed in spooks, and witches, and hobgoblins, and various signs and wonders, were all victims of superstition.

From simple credulity the element of the marvellous and preternatural is missing. Boswell told Dr. Johnson that while in Italy he had several times seen the experiment tried of placing a scorpion within a circle of burning coals, and that in every instance the scorpion, after trying to break through the fiery circle, retired to the centre and committed suicide by darting its sting into its head. But the doctor was sceptical; appearances are deceptive; he would not believe the story unless some competent anatomist, after dissecting the scorpion, declared that the creature really had killed itself. It was probably the doctor's combativeness, or disposition to differ, that saved him in that case. Had the story had any element of the mysterious or preternatural in it, so as to have touched Johnson's religious fears and prejudices, he would doubtless have accepted it at once.

It was once commonly believed that the salamander could withstand fire, but an old Catholic traveller in the sixteenth century says he caught one and put it into the fire, and it died. But he believed the story of the basilisk—namely, that its look was fatal. He said, though, that it was necessary for the animal to look its victim in the eye at a certain distance. He saw a basilisk, but it was dead. If it had been living, probably he would not have been as ready to test its powers as he was those of the salamander. Like Dr. Johnson, he was not credulous unless his credulity could take a superstitious turn.

A good instance of the credulity of science in its youth is furnished by Albert Magnus, who in his book upon animals, in the sixteenth century, says that eels leave the water in the night, invade fields and gardens, and feed upon peas and lentils. A French missionary, writing on natural history in the seventeenth century, says of the humming-bird, that it passes the winter in a torpid state, hanging by its feet from the under side of a limb in the woods. The credulity of country people in reference to the divining-rod, or the efficacy of twigs of the beech or the willow in the hands of certain persons in locating hidden springs or water-veins, etc., is equally childish.

Credulity and superstition have to do mainly with the visible material universe; faith with the spiritual invisible world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Faith is, as Amiel says in his "Journal," "certitude without proof," and is therefore opposed to science, which goes entirely upon proof. It is a moral rather than an intellectual certitude; a conviction of the heart—to use the old phraseology—rather than a persuasion of the mind. That is, it is arrived at through an emotional process, rather than through a mental or logical one. In an over-intellectual and over-reflective age like ours, faith undoubtedly suffers a decline. It thrives best in stirring uncritical times. The scientific spirit is as inimical to it as frost to vegetation. In all the centuries of our era, except the present, reason has been the willing servant of faith. Faith has said to it, Go here, go there; prove this, prove that; and reason has obeyed with alacrity. In our day reason turns upon faith and questions its right to rule and to lead, and the result is an almost ruinous shrinkage of the old theological values.

Dr. Fisher insists upon the proofs of faith, but he fails to point them out. They are not to be apprehended by the rational faculties. They are subjective; they are in the heart and conscience of the individual, and cannot be communicated as proof. That there is a power not ourselves, a power in which we live, and move, and have our being, and of which all things are the garment and expression, is not a matter of faith, but of reason and sense. That this power is a personal being, the moral governor and ruler of the universe, as the old theology has it, or the loving father and protector, as the new teaches, is a matter of faith. We speak of the creed of the church as a system of faith. The acceptance of most of its tenets is an act of faith rather than of reason. That Jesus of Nazareth was born of a woman is a matter of reason; that he was born of a virgin and had no earthly father is a matter of faith. That he was persecuted, that he suffered and died upon the cross, we have no difficulty in believing; but that he rose from the dead, and ascended bodily up into heaven, is, again, a truth that belongs solely to faith. And so with the rest of the Apostles' Creed.

There is a passage in Goethe's autobiography that bears upon this subject, and a very suggestive one.

"General, natural religion," he says, "properly speaking, requires no faith; for the persuasion that a great producing, regulating, and conducting Being conceals himself, as it were, behind Nature, to make himself comprehensible to us—such a conviction forces itself upon every one. Nay, if we for a moment let drop this thread which conducts us through life, it may be immediately and everywhere resumed. But it is different with a special religion which announces to us that this Great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Being distinctly and preëminently interests himself for one individual, one family, one people, one country. This religion is founded on faith, which must be immovable if it would not be instantly destroyed. Every doubt of such a religion is fatal to it. One may return to conviction, but not to faith."

St. Paul saw the difficulties in the way of an appeal to reason, and said boldly that "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." To expect a man to affirm it by his unaided reason, or upon any grounds of evidence that can be had, is to expect the impossible. But Dr. Fisher says we have proof in its nature experimental, like the verification of the calculations of the astronomer by an eclipse occurring exactly on time—namely, in the miracles. But if an appeal is made to reason, does he not see that reason demands proof that the miracles occurred? Eclipses occur in our day, but miracles do not. The laws and processes of nature are continuous, but theology introduces us to a world devoid of continuity.

Theologians lay much stress upon contemporary belief and opinion—upon the statement of those who themselves either witnessed the miracles or simply voiced the popular belief in their reality. But in such matters contemporary opinion counts for but little. The contemporary belief in the reality of witchcraft is perfectly overpowering. There is not merely a cloud of witnesses—there is a world of witnesses. The contemporary belief in the statue of Lot's wife upon the shores of the Dead Sea and of the marvellous character of the Dead Sea itself—namely, that it was black and sticky, that it spit forth fire, that it threw up great foul masses that burned like pitch, that the fruit upon its shores was filled with ashes, etc.; that is, the testimony of reputable travellers, Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans, who had visited the sea and witnessed these wonders—is as convincing as such testimony can be. Yet do we not now know that either the witnesses saw falsely or else reported falsely what they saw? Sir John Mandeville says he saw iron swim in the Dead Sea and a feather sink, and that it vomited up masses of fiery matter as big as a horse; and Sir John was a pious man.

I think we may safely rest upon the statement that *no natural evidence can establish the supernatural.* Our senses cannot apprehend it because it is supersensible; our reason cannot verify it because it transcends reason. The historical proofs of Christianity are adequate to establish ordinary events, but not extraordinary.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. McCosh says the resurrection of Jesus is as well established as any event of ancient history—as the death of Cæsar, for instance. So it would be if it was a natural event like the death of Cæsar; but it was a supernatural event, and no amount of evidence can make it credible to the understanding. Our only refuge is faith.

John Locke stated the truth about this matter of faith and reason two hundred years ago.

"There being many things," he says, "wherein we have very imperfect notions, or none at all; and other things of whose past, present, or future existence, by the natural use of our faculties, we can have no knowledge at all; these as being beyond the discovery of our natural faculties, and above reason, are, when revealed, the proper matter of faith. Thus, that part of the angels rebelled against God, and thereby lost their first happy state; and that the dead shall rise and live again: these, and the like, being beyond the discovery of reason, are purely matters of faith, with which reason has directly nothing to do."

But Locke says that reason is to judge whether or not the revelation be genuine. Yet what test the reason has of the validity of a revelation the philosopher does not set forth.

If the facts or truths revealed are above reason, how can the fact of the revelation itself be proved to reason? Is faith itself reasonable? Of course it all depends upon the assumption with which we start. If we start with the assumption upon which the church is founded, namely, the assumption of an anthropomorphic God, an Infinite Person, the creator and upholder of all things, whose plans with reference to man have not gone smoothly, but have been sadly deranged and frustrated by man himself through what we call sin, so that the creature is hopelessly estranged from the creator, and so on through the rest of the theological formula,—if we start with this assumption, all the rest comes easy: faith and revelation are reasonable, the theory of the Christ and the atonement is reasonable, and with one or two more assumptions, which Cardinal Newman readily makes, the Catholic Church becomes the very child and servant of reason. It is reasonable that this Infinite Person, who is not here upon earth, but in heaven, should want a representative, a vicar, in this world, to look after the well-being of his children, etc., and what more reasonable than that the great mother church, the church which the apostles founded, should be that vicar, that representative? The Protestant churches are all more or less compromises with the devil—that is, with reason, with sense, with the natural man; but the Catholic Church makes no compromises with the individ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nal; it stands for authority. In fact, out of the purely human or anthropomorphic conception of the universe upon which our theology is based, it arises as the inevitable result. If your assumption at one end of the Christian scheme is reasonable, your acceptance of the Catholic Church at the other is equally so. If the universe is an institution, a government, a hierarchy, and if mankind are in a lost and rebellious condition with reference to the head of this government or hierarchy, then does the idea of an infallible pope and all the saving ordinances of the church harmonize perfectly with this conception.

When you once assume the existence of the supernatural, you adjust your reason to that assumption. "If the supernatural exists, it is reasonable that it should exist; it is reasonable that it should present difficulties, that we should be able to apprehend it only in part, that we should need a special endowment of power or insight, called faith, to fully enter into it; it is reasonable that faith should not obliterate the inferior intellectual faculties, but should supplement and raise them; it is reasonable that there should be a revealed religion, and that this religion should possess mysteries."

St. Paul's definition of faith the religious mind has clung to very fondly—namely, "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen"; and Dr. Fisher's new version of the passage—namely, "the firm assurance of things hoped for, the being convinced of things not seen"—can hardly take its place in the popular conscience. It is true, but not taking. Faith is neither evidence nor substance, though the religious world is constantly persuading itself that it is. "It makes real to the mind objects of hope"—so real that "they exercise a due control in the shaping of conduct."

As we have been long taught, belief in the Christian religion is more a matter of will than of reason. The will must be reached or enlisted first. Coleridge said to Crabb Robinson that "religious belief is an act, not of the understanding, but of the will. To become a believer one must love the doctrine and feel in harmony with it, and not sit down and coolly inquire whether he should believe it or not."

Hence I agree with Dr. Fisher that in these matters "the timidity of reason has to be overcome by a courageous exercise of will. In appropriating, or making our own, the things of faith,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is a venture to be made on the ground of evidence, without the stimulus and support of an appeal to the senses." People of strong wills, men of action and of affairs, are less apt to be sceptical than more purely meditative and intellectual minds. Wordsworth said of his poet,

> "You must love him, ere to you
> He will seem worthy of your love";

and of the Christian faith it is equally true that you must believe it ere it seems worthy of your credence. How to do this is the great problem. Hence the cry that goes up from the churches continually for more faith, more faith.

I have said that faith begins where reason ends; but by this statement I would only emphasize the fact that the province of the one lies entirely outside the province of the other. In the order of nature faith is first. We find ourselves in possession of a certain belief or certitude, and then we proceed to reason about it. In the order of historical development religion is not a matter of belief, of creeds and dogmas, but of observances. The early nations had certain religious rites and practices, but no belief, in our sense of the word—that is, as a conscious intellectual act. A man cannot reason himself into religion, though he can reason himself into religious opinions. Religion is a sentiment just as much as poetry is, and does not wait upon the logical faculties any more than poetry does. The demonstrations of science no competent mind can resist, but the demonstrations of religion, its proofs, evidences, etc., only impress such minds as are already convinced, as have already taken the leap which faith requires.

Religious faith is losing ground in our day because the light which fills the world, begotten by science, education, industry, democracy, is more and more the light of broad noonday, clear, strong, merciless. Our fathers stood much nearer the twilight, the region of sentiment, of emotion, of enticing, but delusive, lights and shades. The morning of the world is past: what the completed day will show forth does not yet appear.

JOHN BURROUGHS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PECULIARITIES OF THE SOUTH.

BY PROF. N. S. SHALER, OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

AMID the important and immediate tasks which the overthrow of slavery put upon the people of North and South alike, the interesting nature of the social ruin from which they have been reconstructing a new dwelling-place has received but little attention. When men have just crawled out from the *débris* of an ancient edifice which has tumbled down upon their heads, while they are endeavoring to save something from the wreck and to provide themselves with shelter, it is not to be expected or desired that they shall dwell much upon the history and architectural defects of the building. It is doubtful, indeed, if they will at the moment welcome the speculations of the curious bystander in matters so far from their immediate needs. Even if the circumstances which have led to the disaster have the utmost philosophical interest, the judicious commentator will abstain from his discourse until the stage of suffering is over. Thus if the overthrowing has been done by an earthquake, the considerate man, even if his consideration be directed to his own safety, will surely not try to explain how the damage came from building insecure dwellings when shocks of violence are to be apprehended. His valuable remarks concerning the "seismic vertical" and "earth tensions" should be postponed until his hearers have cleared the dirt from their eyes. If he is compelled by his fulness to speak prematurely, his preachment best be from a safe distance.

But there comes a time, and that soon, when the philosophy of their misfortunes is interesting to all sufferers who love wisdom; when the steps which have led to their calamities, and the moral thereof, are welcome to their ears; for to such people the truth is always good and helpful. We Americans are quick to discern what part of our actions has escaped from the field of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

immediate and passionate interest into the calm realm of history. In this capacity for letting the dead past lie, we have gained, or perhaps some will say lost, ground as compared with our kinsmen over the sea. I have known British squires who would flame with rage at the mention of Oliver Cromwell, but I have not in years seen a Confederate soldier to whom the Civil War did not appear to be a matter of some remote traditional age. This curious turning from the past makes it at once easier and more important for us to take account of the former social conditions of the old South—easier, for the reason that we may not then fear to arouse prejudices; and more important, because these conditions will soon be utterly lost to view.

In endeavoring to comprehend the social condition of any people, it is necessary to understand the permanent states of mind which determine the relations they hold with their fellow-beings, for therein lies the real field of difference in the most essential qualities of men. These inherited and rooted prejudices are so deeply buried in human nature that they are not readily disclosed even to the observant eye; they are commonly not apprehended by those who are affected by them. In most cases these powerful but obscure motives are masked by more powerful impulses which are common to all men. The habits of courteous contact between men, the strong tendencies to common fashions in clothing and general behavior, by giving a uniform external expression to all who belong to our race and time, deceive the unwary into the notion that there is no radical difference in these like-appearing folk: great as are the similarities between human beings, we must perceive the vast and overwhelming importance of their diversities before we can find standing-ground from which profitably to study their behavior.

The most serious part of the difficulties which have come about in the intercourse between the people of the Northern and Southern States of this Union has arisen from a failure of each to comprehend the predominant motives of the other. Each has measured the other's actions from his own prejudices, assuming in the judgment the identity of spirit which did not exist. To see the real difference between these people, who appear so similar, requires opportunities of insight which fortune has given to few. That I may not appear presumptuous in the explanation which it is my purpose to essay, it is necessary to state that half

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my life has been spent in characteristic Northern communities and half in equally representative parts of the South, and this with such repeated exchanges of dwelling-place from one region to another as would afford a good chance for observation. My acquaintance with the men of all sorts and conditions in both regions has been very extensive. It is not likely that many persons have had better chances for noting the essential features of these contrasted people.

The easiest way to trace the differences between the characteristic northern and southern divisions of our people is to follow them along their historic paths and to note the manner in which their qualities, inherited from the original colonists, have been qualified by the conditions of their physical and social environment. The tone-giving settlements of this country were founded in the middle part of the seventeenth century; their colonists came from Britain: although there were immigrants from Holland, Sweden, France, and Germany who have made their mark upon the population of the country, they have had little influence upon the general spirit. The life-blood of the land, the best it has of good and evil, was, at least until the period of the Civil War, mainly English. These men came forth from the seething life of the Cromwellian period, when the feudal notions of the middle ages were struggling with the democratic spirit of Protestantism; when nearly every man held within him something of both these classes of impulses, and could by chance readily be led upon either of these diverse ways. We must conceive this curious mixture of impulses typefied in Cavalier and Roundhead, in the followers of Charles and of Calvin, before we can see how it was open to each of the American colonies to develop on either of two widely-separated lines of character according as circumstances gave it over to one or the other of these parties.

The well-shaken dice-box of the seas appears to have determined that the most characteristic of the English Protestants should find foothold in New England, and that the portion of the English people who had been least modernized, who still retained a large element of the feudal notion, should fall heir to the best part of the southern portion of the coast-line about Chesapeake Bay. About these typical colonies other settlements gathered, but the Calvinists resorted generally to the northern portion of the shore, and the reactionary or feudal-minded people gathered about Vir-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ginia: this segregation was accidental and incomplete, but it was sufficiently well accomplished to determine that the characteristic Protestant element controlled New England, as well as most of the other northern colonies, and the English branch of the ancient church the Virginia group of settlements. The difference between these populations was not altogether in their religious spirit; in fact, the faiths may be called symptoms of the general state of mind of these divergent people.

The Virginian was an old Englishman, and was more nearly allied to the ancient type of his race than the people of the northern settlements, whom we may fitly call the New-Englanders. He belonged to that conservative body who sustain rather than amend society. In the seventeenth century, when he parted from the parent home, he took with him the notions of a society which still retained a large share of the feudal spirit. The literature of that time shows that, while the Puritan had departed widely from the ancestral type, the body of the people had retained a large share of the traditions concerning the relations of men to each other which the system of the middle ages implanted in their race. It is characteristic of the feudal notions that they singularly impressed themselves on the individual, shaping his modes of thought through deeply-implanted prejudices and ambitions. In that system of human relations the ideas of personal honor, of fidelity to a chief, of the motive of valor, and of the obligations to codes of soldierly conduct possessed the minds of men so entirely that there was little place for other considerations. Already the stern Protestant spirit of the Puritan was leading a great body of men out of this castellated state of mind toward more modern ways of thought. The feudal system, although it had noble qualities, was essentially hedonistic; it was based on an elevated savagery; under its dominion men were forced to shape their lives mainly on personal considerations. The best of its notions, those of personal honor and loyalty to the chief, were founded on selfish motives. Though the Puritan is a less picturesque and agreeable figure than the Cavalier, he had the advantage that a large part of his thought went forth to the great external problems of a singularly dominating religious faith. Individual dignity, the respect in which one is held by the men of the same estate, became of less importance to those who were ever concerned about the matter of their eternal salvation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus through this intense Protestantism the characteristic traits of feudalism were rapidly effaced in the peoples who were brought under the intense Calvinistic life of the typical New England colonies, while they remained in the southern colonies, where there were at first relatively few of the Genevan faith.

Among the strong and society-shaping prejudices of the feudal time was that which separated the men of the higher class from hand labor. Although military employment had ceased to be a steadfast and common pursuit, the old idea that the well-cultured man was not to engage in manual pursuits was still held in English society. In large measure the prejudice against shopkeeping also found a place in the transplantations from the old country to the southern colonies; in fact, the social "outfit" of these settlements was largely made up of mediæval customs which had survived the conditions which gave them birth. Such is the continuity of tradition that for many generations habits of mind which have been once well affirmed by use survive and manifest themselves as fashions long after their immediate utility has passed away. They remain like the buttons on the back of our coats, which once served to hold the sword-belt, though three generations have passed since they ceased to have any function but ornament.

Thus by the accidents which led to New England a select body of Protestants who had severed their minds from the traditions of the feudal system, and to the Virginian colonies settlers who were still in the succession of the ancient life of their race, it came about that the populations which were to have the largest share in determining the motives of this country started with very decided diversities in character. These differences were further accented by certain economic conditions. Servitude, either in the form of "indented servants" or of African slaves, was planted in all the original colonies, but it took no firm root in the northern settlements, for there the agriculture was mainly limited to products of domestic consumption, and the climate appears to have been unfavorable to the negroes. The indented servant soon disappeared, but the African bondman remained to take a fatal part in the history of the southern settlements. It was early perceived that the institution of slavery afforded excellent ground for the seed of feudalism which remained alive among the southern people. On this soil these germs took good root and flourished amazingly. In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the mother-country the lower classes were already essentially free, the servile conditions having practically disappeared before the colonists left their homes. Slavery gave the foundations on which a new feudalism of a modern, but characteristic, type was founded.

There are those who regret that this country lacks the picturesque ruins of mediæval castles which lend so gracious a perspective to the visible history of the old world; but if these persons could perceive the intellectual architecture of the land, they would behold in all the Southern States the relics of a multitude of feudal strongholds which have survived to our own day. Every plantation was in its way baronial. There was the master, a lord on whose will depended the fate of his household. He owned men, who gave to him the labor of their lives, and to whom he owed protection from birth to death. Though it was without many of the elements of its ancient dignity, and somewhat hampered by the civil law, the essence of the feudal relation was here. All social relations whatsoever inevitably feel the impress which comes on men where the lower class is owned by the higher. If the fates had sent the Pilgrims and Puritans to Virginia, and given the stubborn fields of Connecticut and Massachusetts to the settlers of the Potomac, we should doubtless have had much the same social conditions which were developed in these countries. The men who settled Massachusetts Bay, if their homes had been in the South, would in time have reverted to mediæval conditions, while the people of the South would have adjusted their scheme of life to the more northern clime.

As soon as African slavery was firmly established by the development of the tobacco trade, and yet more when its power was reënforced by the growth of the industry in cotton, the forces of commerce, more powerful for good or evil than governments or religions, determined the destiny of the South. At first the Virginia group of colonies contained a considerable body of what may be termed yeomen, and these men had their share in the life of the people. Rapidly, however, the white society became divided into the masterful class of slave-owners and the subordinate class of poor whites. This latter group was pushed into inferior and despised stations. They differed but little in social position from the blacks, except that they retained the right to bear arms, and their sons, if of great ability, might, through success, mount to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the estate of the masterful class. These freemen, only half-emancipated because they were not masters of slaves, drifted apart from the great plantations and mostly took refuge upon those fields of the southern territory which were not fit for the use of the ruling class. The mountain valleys of the Blue Ridge and the Alleghenies gave them the sites for little farms that were unfit for the tillage of the crops which made slave-holding profitable. There they formed independent and singularly isolated communities, in which no negroes were ever seen; there they retained something of the rude freedom of the English yeomen and kept unchanged the motives and the customs which they had brought from the old world. Within twenty years I have seen the English short-bow in familiar and serviceable use among these people in hunting small game. The ancient type of pack-saddle there held, and may still hold, its place in carrying the exports of ginseng, feathers, and beeswax from these settlements over the narrow trackways which alone linked them with the outer world.

The rapid development of plantation life in the part of the South—in all about half its area—where the soil and climate favored the growth of the four staples which were the economic basis of slavery—cotton, tobacco, rice, and sugar—soon forced this yeoman class into the mountain valleys or into the poorer lands. Thus the country became divided into two great districts, separated from each other by the character of their populations. The slave-holding people occupied with their characteristic life the vast lowlands and lower table-lands which surround the Appalachians on the east, the south, and the west. With them dwelt the remnants of the small, non-slave-holding whites who had not betaken themselves to separate communities. In the midst of this plantation district the great promontory of the Appalachian Mountains extended from the Potomac to northern Alabama, including more than half of Virginia, the greater part of the Carolinas, northern Georgia, and eastern Tennessee and Kentucky. Here, except where the highlands were penetrated by broad valleys, slavery had hardly more place than in the Berkshire Hills of Massachusetts. There are, indeed, at the present day probably more white people who have never seen a negro in this part of the United States than in all New England. In camping expeditions in the southern Appalachians I have frequently been amused at the curiosity of the whites concerning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my negro servants : men and women would ride twenty miles to see the black men and stare them out of countenance. Nothing but a public and well-heralded hanging would toll them so far from their cabins.

In this way, by the natural, though imperfect, segregation of the rich and the poor whites, there grew up in the South communities tolerably separated from each other and singularly parted from the outer world. The slave-holders, by the peculiar antiseptic effect of the institution which controlled their society, were preserved, as in a pickle, from the ferments of modern civilization, and the free white communities of the hill country were entirely isolated from the contacts of the outer world by the peculiar social conditions of the country which wrapped them in.

Although the social pecularities of the mountaineers of the South have been made the subject of some interesting literature, their dialects and customs, which are in part a survival of old English fashions and in part of local institution, deserve far more attention from ethnologists than they have received. As regards the more important motives which we find among these people, they are all clearly derived from their old-world ancestry. In this writing it is impossible for me to trace, even in outline, the many interesting pecularities which are evident even in the superficial inspection which I have been able to give to these mountaineers.

The sense of personal honor in all except matters of a commercial nature is as keen among these peasant proprietors as it is in the plantation class. The liar and the poltroon are detested as much as in the superior society of the South : curiously enough, however, these people of the hills have invented certain peculiar insults and gages of combat which find no place elsewhere. It is, for instance, an offence to approach a lonely cabin, especially at night, without hailing the inmates from a distance. If there be no man or boy about, the wayfarer must move on without seeking to enter. One of the deadliest insults which can be offered to the mountaineer is to injure his horse, even if the damage be only to the appearance of the creature. The most ineradicable feuds I have ever known have been begun in the following curious manner : two men quarrel over some business trifle, such as their right in an illicit still or a land boundary; the difficulty, being a mere matter of money value, can easily be forgotten ; but one of the combatants, desiring to place the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

test on a higher and more manly ground, catches his adversary's saddle-horse and clips the hair from his tail, or, as it is sometimes phrased, "mules his critter." Then it is for generations a murderous warfare between the families of the contestants. Something of the same obscure motive may be traced in the conduct of the plantationer whose slave had been beaten by a man of the master's class. Although the owner would probably have been willing to chastise the servant on the request of a reasonable neighbor of his own rank, he would rarely submit to having the punishment inflicted by another. In both these examples the dominant motives may be regarded as a relic of feudalism; of a state of society where a man owed protection to all the life which was subject to his will.

We can see the same impulse to the protective relation in the management of the slaves on the plantations. It is true that here and there were masters who did not consider their servants, who were brutal in their treatment of them; but, on the whole, the relation of the slave-owners to their servants was kindly and gentle. The negroes usually were tenderly guarded in their infancy and old age, and in their years of toil were not overdriven. There were inevitable elements of barbarism in the institution; but when we consider the previous condition of the African race, and the state to which its American representatives had been brought at the end of slavery in this country, we are forced to the conviction that a vast amount of really profitable education had been given to this people. This education of the blacks indicates the long-continued and incessant application of care to their best interests. It is true that this care was in large part directed to economic ends, but the part of it which has proved most profitable to the negro consisted in the devotion of their masters to their moral well-being. It may be considered doubtful whether an utterly foreign and savage race such as the African could have been domesticated under any other system than that afforded by the revived feudalism of the South. To civilize such a people, to develop and fix by inheritance the laboriousness and other elements of social order which the negro has acquired, demands a peculiar control such as the conditions of slavery could alone have imposed upon them.

In the earlier ages of our civilization the system of the overlord did much to bring order out of the earlier barbarism. By a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

process of selection it put the management of the lower classes into the hands of the abler men of each generation. It was an iron rule, and yet it was in its way beneficent, for it gave the control of the savage elements to the more civilized men, which is, perhaps, the first and most necessary purpose of a social organization. In somewhat the same way the return of the population of the slave-holding States to the feudal system served to make the subjugation of the Africans possible: with such a task upon this people no other system was possible. Indeed, we may observe that wherever the institution of slavery exists it inevitably leads to the lordly dominance of the master class.

If we adopt the hypothesis, as it seems reasonable to do, that Southern society is to be regarded as a survival of the same feudal-life conditions which two centuries ago still existed in the mother-country, while the new English life of the North, untrammelled by domestic slavery, has gone forward into the modern fields of thought and action, we may account for the most important differences between the two sections. The separation between these American divisions of English people was originally well marked, for the parting action between the ancient and the modern spirit began in the mother-country. Repressive of freedom as Calvinism was in certain things, it forced men to think of spiritual concerns in an intense way; moreover, it parted them from the intellectual past of their race and opened the way to free thought. Under its influence men who were occupied with the question of their relations to the Infinite lost the sense of their personal importance; it was no longer a matter of supreme moment what their neighbors thought of them; and so the somewhat inflamed sensitiveness on matters of honor which had characterized their ancestors of the feudal times disappeared in the North, while it survived in the South. Furthermore, the development of the economic system of the North tended to make the tests of conduct other than in the slave-holding community; commercial honor in a way took the place of the knightly form of that sense.

The most curious difference between these peoples, and on some accounts the most inexplicable, is found in the varied estimation in which life is held by them. Nothing so surprises the Northern people as the fact that Southern men of good estate will, for what seem to the distant onlooker trifling matters of dispute, proceed to slay each other. Nothing so gravely offends the char-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acteristic Southern man as the incapacity of his brethren of Northern societies to perceive that such action is natural and consistent with the rules of gentlemanly behavior. The only way to understand these differences of opinion is by a proper consideration of the history of the moral growth of these diverse peoples. The Southerner has retained and fostered—in a certain way reinstated—the mediæval estimate as to the value of life. In the opinion of those ages it was but lightly esteemed; it was not a supreme good for which almost all else was to be sacrificed, but something to be taken in hand and put in risk in the pursuit of manly ideals. Modernism has worked to intensify the passion for existence until those who are the most under its dominion cannot well conceive how a man, except for some supreme duty to which he is pledged by altruistic motives, can give up his own life or take that of his neighbor. If these people of to-day will but perceive that the characteristic Southerner has preserved the motives of two centuries ago, if they will but inform themselves as to the state of mind on this subject which prevailed in the epoch when those motives were shaped in men, they will see that their judgment is harsh and unreasonable. It is much as if they judged the actions of Englishmen of the seventeenth century by the changed standards of to-day.

Nor will it be altogether reasonable to condemn the lack of the regard of life which we find in the Southern gentleman as compared with his Northern contemporary. We must, of course, reprobate in every way the evil consequences of this state of mind; but the question as to the propriety of that extreme devotion to continued mundane existence which is so manifest in our modern civilization is certainly open to debate. Irrational and brutal as are the ways in which the old-fashioned gentleman of the South shows that his regard for his own honor or that of his household outweighs his love of life, it must be remembered that the same condition existed in the richest ages of our race—those which gave proportionately the largest share of ability and nobility to its history. As long as men are more keenly sensitive to the opinions of their fellows than they are to the other goods which existence brings them, as long as this opinion makes personal valor and truthfulness the jewels of their lives, we must expect now and then to have degradation of the essentially noble motives. It is, undoubtedly, a dangerous state of mind, but not one that is degraded.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The explanation of the disgraceful Southern street fights which take place between men of good social estate is partly to be found in the history of the duel in that part of the country. Up to about fifty years ago the wager of battle there was still a common way of settling serious disputes. The sober-minded people, even those who under certain conditions would themselves resort to the duel, endeavored to crush the evil by legislation. Laws of the utmost severity were passed, which made it a crime to take any part, either as principal or second, in such contests; all persons engaged in them were liable to be disfranchised. The result was such as is usually found in the effort to regulate social evils by enactments: duelling became rare or ceased altogether, and much more deplorable ways of fighting took its place. It has been found impossible to convict men of murder for such crimes, provided the jury is convinced that the assailant's honor was aggrieved and that he gave his adversary notice of his intention to assail him. We cannot hope for a change in this deplorable condition until the process of modernizing the South has convinced men that the common law is more sacred than the motives of the individual man, whatever be the circumstances which arouse them.

In judging our Southern brethren we should, if we would be reasonable, bear in mind the fact that, while in the mere external uniform of civilization they presented the aspects of our time, they were until the end of slavery dwelling in the mediæval age. Their motives in many ways constituted the most interesting remnant of that period which had survived in this century. At present the strong tide of modernism is sweeping over the old slave-holding States with a force which is certain to clear away a greater part of the archaic motives which so long held place in the minds of the people. With the death of the generation which saw the Rebellion the ancient *régime* will disappear. It is to be hoped that the better part of those inheritances from the age of chivalry may survive and mingle with the essential good of modern life: the keen sense of personal honor, the respect for women, the belief in the dignity of courage and external manners, which these ideas give to men and women, may well enter into and serve to ennoble their new life.

N. S. Shaler.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. BALFOUR'S ANSWER TO MR. PARNELL.

BY THE RIGHT HON. JOHN MORLEY, M. P.

THE Irish Minister opens his reply to the Irish leader with the remark that the history of the land question is the history of Ireland. *In a sense this is true, but it is only true on condition that* you include within the land question the effect upon it of the political question. It is safe to say that no statesman before ever undertook to transform the land system of a country without regard to its political condition. Mr. Balfour believes that you can deal with the land question by itself; that you can settle that without touching self-government; and that when every occupier is turned into an owner, then extension of self-government will be either harmless or superfluous.

This belief is the foundation of the remedial policy of the Unionist party. Not, however, of the whole of that party. There is a remarkable and significant exception. The Irish contingent —the landlords, who may be supposed to have their wits sharpened by the instinct of self-preservation—regard their champion's land policy with unconcealed aversion and distrust. Some of them deliberately abstained from voting for it; others plucked up courage to speak against it; and none of them would say a word in support of it. Lord Erne, one of the leading men among the landlords, has deliberately said that Mr. Balfour's measure ought to be called a Bill for Facilitating the Expulsion of the English Garrison from Ireland. This is because they know that you cannot divorce the land question from the political question, and because they face the obvious fact that to buy out the landlords is to leave the Nationalists masters of the situation.

In that case, asks Mr. Balfour, why do the Nationalists oppose my bill, and why is it opposed by English politicians who have themselves produced purchase bills? The answer to the second question is that it is one thing to bring forward a purchase

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bill with the active assent of the most important parties to the bargain, and in connection with a great political settlement; and quite another thing to lend large sums of public money to a country which has not given its consent, whose political demand you refuse to listen to, and which, therefore, will have a perilously good excuse for repudiating the whole transaction whenever its leaders think the time convenient. The plan of 1886 was justified in the mind of its framers by the expectation that it would promote a full settlement of the political relations of Great Britain and Ireland. The present plan not only points to no such settlement, but is set up by Mr. Balfour as the foundation-stone of a policy intended to exclude it.

As for the Nationalists, Mr. Parnell, whom at last the successes of his fourteen years' struggle have taught Englishmen and Scotchmen to regard as one of the most clear-sighted men now in public life, has frankly stated his objections to the bill. Considering himself to be within sight of a government in Ireland for which he would be responsible, he opposes any step being taken now which would make repudiation of an English bargain a plausible policy for any party in Ireland at a future time. It will evidently be the first interest of the Irish government to which he looks forward to avoid both all quarrels with England and any depreciation of Irish credit in the money market. Next, Mr. Parnell holds that the thirty-three millions which are to be advanced by the British exchequer will be wasted; that they will only turn the wrong people into the owners of their land, while the small men, who really constitute the land question in Ireland, will be left where they are, and the root of the difficulty will not be touched. Finally, he protests against the hypothecation of funds belonging to Irishmen as a whole, and without their leave asked or given, for the benefit of that privileged section of Irishmen to whom their landlords choose to sell their holdings.

Mr. Parnell restated these objections in a recent speech in Parliament, which excited much attention, and to which Mr. Balfour promised his "respectful consideration." I have little hope that this respectful consideration will bear fruit. For one thing, he has committed himself strongly to the position that no local authorities, either existing or to be created, could be trusted with the working of his land scheme.* Nor are his landlord friends

* See Hansard, May 1, 1890, p. 1930.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at all likely to allow him to give an effective voice in the sale and purchase of their property to local authorities who would be almost to a man Nationalist.

It is pretty certain, therefore, that the process which is called settling the land question will be carried through Parliament against the judgment both of Irish Nationalists and Irish Unionists, actually including not only the landlords but the tenant farmers of Ulster. The scheme sets up relations of debtor and creditor between Ireland and Great Britain for half a century to come. It goes, as any scheme so deeply affecting the land system of any country must go, to the very roots of the social and economic life of the community. Yet this scheme is to be imposed upon Ireland without the approval of any organized section of the community, because it is the only possible substitute that Mr. Balfour can think of for that extension of constitutional self-government against which he and his party have hardened their hearts.

This singular attempt comes of Mr. Balfour's unfortunate misreading of his own proposition that the history of the land question is the history of Ireland. As if one main reason why the history of Ireland has been so woful and so disastrous were not the never-ending circle of settlement, unsettlement, and resettlement of the land without the aid and in defiance of the counsels of Irishmen representing the experience, the judgment, and the sentiment of the people most concerned. The Encumbered-Estates Act was passed in 1848, as Mr. Gladstone has said, "with a general lazy, uninformed, and irreflective good intention of taking capital to Ireland." Nothing is so dangerous as irreflective good intention. Its effect was a wholesale confiscation of the tenants' improvements, followed by deep and just discontent and turbulence in the population. In 1860 a law was made that the relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland should henceforth be a relation of contract, and not of tenure. This did so much harm that in 1870 a new law was made, that the relation should be one of tenure, and not of contract. That did so little good that in 1881 yet a third law was made, that the terms of the relation should be neither of tenure nor contract, but should be fixed by a court. Finally, the policy of 1890 aims at putting an end to the relation of landlord and tenant altogether, and this immense operation, like the other distracting operations before it, is to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shaped and executed against the will and without the aid either of landlords or of tenants.

Why does not Mr. Balfour see that, whatever may be your land system upon paper, its healthy working must depend upon the existence and the activity of a sound and organized public opinion? He aims at superseding dual owners by peasant proprietors. But what is to prevent the man to-day sitting at a fair rent, and to-morrow made into the owner by means of an advance from the state on payment of an annuity 25 or 30 per cent. below the fair rent, from proceeding the day after to-morrow to let his land to somebody else at the fair rent of to-day, and putting the 25 or 30 per cent. difference into his own pocket, which will be the old landlord pocket over again? Is not this a certainty? I know there will be a clause in the act against sub-letting. Who believes that the clause will be worth a farthing unless the vigilant and organized public opinion of the country is on the side of such a clause? But if you wish to organize an energetic and wholesome public opinion in Ireland, you must give it a chance of free, normal, regular, continuous, and effective expression. Where is that expression to be sought if not in some form of responsible self-government? If a system of peasant proprietorship were launched on a large scale in Ireland to-morrow, it would break down as rapidly as the systems before it unless it is connected with a renovated executive and legislative system.

It is highly instructive to notice what happened in this very matter after the Union. Mr. Balfour very properly looks to Irish history to explain the circumstances of those districts which are crowded with tenants who could by no possibility extract a prosperous livelihood from the soil. What is the explanation from history? This overcrowding, says Mr. Balfour,

"is not improbably due to the fact that in the old days of the 40s. freeholder the landlord was of opinion that he gained in political importance by multiplying the number of voters on his estate, and made therefore no serious efforts to check, if he did not absolutely encourage, the rapid growth of population and the excessive subdivision of holdings."

This is, no doubt, a true explanation, but it is not all. Nobody can candidly study Irish history without coming to the conclusion that this reckless and baleful policy of the Irish landlords would have been rendered impossible if a parliament had been sitting in Dublin, where the state of the country would have been closely and continuously observed, instead of being relegated to the dim

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and intermittent attention of select committees at Westminster. If such an assembly had been in existence, who can doubt that a public opinion would inevitably have formed and expressed itself, strong enough to make the landlords themselves ashamed of furthering the political interests of some of them at the cost of infinite disaster to their country for generations to come? The Duke of Wellington, in explaining the necessity of resort to public money to relieve the periodical scarcity in Ireland, describes how

"the proprietors of the country, those who ought to think for the people, to foresee this misfortune, and to provide a remedy beforehand for it, are amusing themselves in the clubs of London, in Cheltenham or Bath, or the Continent, and the government are made responsible for the evil, and they must find a remedy for it where they can—anywhere excepting in the pockets of the Irish gentleman. Then the public money, if given for this distress, is applied to all purposes excepting the one for which it is given, and most particularly to that one—viz., the payment of the arrears of an exorbitant rent." *

Does anybody believe that this detestable policy could have been persisted in, if the voice of Ireland could have made itself heard in its own government?

It is the peculiar inconsistency of Mr. Balfour's proposal that, while he refuses to allow to public opinion in Ireland a voice in the most important of Irish affairs, he yet assumes such probity in that opinion that he is willing to lend Irishmen upwards of forty millions sterling. It is true that he guards his loan with a string of elaborate securities. They remind one of the famous sporran of Rob Roy. The outlaw kept his money in a great leathern pouch. The pouch could only be opened by mastering an elaborate system of studs, springs, and buttons; while a small steel pistol concealed inside was ready to discharge its contents into anybody who, being unacquainted with the secret, should tamper with the intricacies of the lock. "The simplicity of the contrivance," says Frank Osbaldistone, "to secure a furred pouch, which could have been ripped open without any attempt on the spring, reminded me of the verses in the Odyssey where Ulysses is content to secure his property by casting a curious and involved complication of cordage around the sea-chest in which it was deposited." If the Irish are ever minded to repudiate, they will assuredly make short work of the springs, the steel pistol, and the knotted cordage of Mr. Balfour's cash guarantees and contingent funds. What would become of all his securities if the

* "Despatches," Second Series, Vol. vii., p. 111.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irish tenants and their leaders were what he habitually assumes them to be? He charges them in this REVIEW with being "a political party violent in their designs to the verge of treason, and unscrupulous in their methods beyond the limits of legality"; with invariably acting on the "avowed intention of making the government of Ireland impossible"; and with regarding "social anarchy as the fitting prelude to home rule." Why, by the way, does he then, with a deference that is almost obsequious, promise "respectful consideration" to anything that falls from the leader of this band of irreconcilable traitors and anarchists? And how can he really suppose, if Ireland is in truth the land he has so often described, more in sorrow than in anger, I allow,—the home of swindlers and the dupes of swindlers,—that these two classes will not break through securities which, he must know, it would be as impracticable to enforce as it was impossible to collect the tithes between 1830 and 1840? This is surely as curious a paradox as buying out and bringing away the landlords whom it has been a cardinal point in Unionism to represent as the only friends of the English connection, thus leaving the country to a population so unruly that a perpetual Coercion Act has just for the first time been passed to keep them forever in order. Such are the incoherences in which Mr. Balfour is involved by the exigencies of the incongruous system to which he has committed himself.

His article does not deal quite ingenuously with the objection taken under the head of these curious securities. The American reader would never guess from his reply, I am sure, what is the vital point in this objection. I don't gather, says Mr. Balfour, whether it is the inexpediency or the injustice that Mr. Parnell complains of in the hypothecation of the imperial contribution to local purposes as security for the imperial loan. "There is no conceivable security for the British exchequer which does not in some form or other involve the seizure, in case of default, of Irish funds which might otherwise be devoted to Irish purposes." What Mr. Balfour very innocently passes over is the point that the pledging of these funds takes place without the assent, direct or indirect, of those to whom they belong, and by whom they have been wholly or in part contributed. Let the reader form a clear idea of what is to happen. A certain number of landlords in the county of Cork agree to sell their holdings to, say, a thousand tenants. The Land Commission advances the price, with a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mortgage on the land, and by the use of British credit is able to do so on such terms that, after paying for forty-nine years an annuity some 25 or 30 per cent. less than his former rent, the happy tenant or his successor finds himself owner in fee.

The American reader may think Purchase rather an odd name to give to such a transaction as this, but let that pass. Suppose the thousand tenants, or any of them, to fall behind in their payments; suppose the state, for political or other reasons, to shrink from foreclosing its mortgage and selling up the defaulters, or suppose it unable, as it assuredly would be unable, to find new buyers ready to step into their place: then the indirect securities become available. In other words, to put it shortly, a levy is made upon all the cesspayers in the County of Cork to render good the default, though the cesspayers have had no will in the transaction, and derive not a shilling of advantage from it; and next, if this levy be not effective, the state will lay its hand upon the sum contributed from the imperial exchequer toward the Cork schools and lunatic asylums! Yet Mr. Balfour is at a loss to understand Mr. Parnell's objection to the hypothecation of Irish resources without Irish assent. He is like King George III., who could never understand why the American colonists were so peculiar and so irrational as not to like the hypothecation of their resources by tea duties and stamp duties.

This invasion of sound principle is all the more extraordinary because in another set of cases Mr. Balfour has shown his sense of its soundness. Many of the Irish railways constructed during the last twenty years have been built on a guarantee from the county or district securing for a fixed number of years the interest on the capital. By standing order of each branch of the legislature, this liability can never be imposed without the assent of the grand jury, or, in some large towns, of the municipal council, as well as of all boards of guardians and all presentment sessions in the guaranteeing district. The veto of a single one out of a dozen bodies is fatal to one of these bills. Last year Mr. Balfour himself brought in a measure to facilitate the construction of light railways in Ireland. One of its provisions was a guarantee from the district benefited. Did the Minister exact the guarantee, as he does in his Land Bill, without regard to the wishes of those upon whom the risk would fall? On the contrary, he proposed that no presentment was to be submitted to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Irish government "unless and until it obtains the assent of the occupiers of the land in the portion of each county within the benefited district, by a vote which shall be taken in the manner and subject to the provisions hereby enacted." On what principle were all these elaborate precautions for popular assent taken in the Light-Railways Bill of 1889, and then all flung to the winds in the Land Bill of 1890? Why, again, is it not as much the duty of Parliament to protect the Irish ratepayer as the British taxpayer? Why should the first run all the risk in order that the second should run no risk? Why should local purposes be paralyzed by the failure of a minority to keep a bargain as to which the majority were never consulted, and from which they derive no advantage? To these reasonable questions Mr. Balfour's article makes no sort of answer.

It will be said that no call will ever be made on these contingent securities, because the state will seize the real security, which is the land. But so long as the political question is unsettled, so long as Ireland is governed by force and not by consent, so long as her leaders are unreconciled, and excluded from any responsible share in the affairs of their own country, for so long we may be quite sure that no British minister would venture to meet a strike against the payment of the annuities by wholesale evictions; for wholesale evictions, besides the loss of his money, would throw on his hands the burden of a homeless population and a mass of derelict and boycotted farms. This explains some remarkably ingenious, but wholly unworkable, precautions in the bill.

In this connection one of the most striking features in Mr. Balfour's measure is its extraordinary weakness in case of the purchasing tenant becoming a defaulter. For example, if the government are persuaded of the existence of exceptional agricultural calamity in any county, they may suspend the sale of holdings where the buyer has fallen into arrear, or they may give him as much time for payment as they think fit. To anybody who knows Ireland, this invitation by statute not to press the defaulter is of the worst significance. Such an invitation to leniency at discretion is likewise, by the very nature of the case, an invitation to the purchaser to fall behind in his instalment. The plain truth is that prompt recovery of a payment in itself equitable and even indulgent is at once the only sure and the only just remedy. Penal interest for unpunctual payment is, I believe, uni-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

versal in French and Swiss land banks; and if Mr. Balfour really meant his plan to work safely and regularly, he would have imposed a penal interest of twopence or threepence per pound or fraction of a pound in an overdue instalment. Besides that, he would have made it obligatory on the Land Department to direct the sheriff to take possession, to sell the holding if he could find anybody to buy it, and if he could find nobody to buy it, then to give possession to any person whom the department might appoint. There is no reason why a tenant unable to pay should not sell his interest, and he should do so in order to avoid forfeiture of it by seizure. However that may be, if Mr. Balfour had in heart expected his transactions to be carried on upon a business-like footing, he would have taken care that no guarantee deposit or reserve fund should be touched until the defaulting buyer has been dispossessed, his title at law extinguished, and his land vested in the bodies who have to make good his default. What all this laxity means is only too clear. It is made necessary by political weakness. Nothing but a national executive, supported by national opinion and sentiment, will feel itself strong enough to proceed to vigorous measures in enforcing its claims; and it is because he refuses to contemplate any but an anti-national executive that Mr. Balfour is obliged to leave all these loopholes for evading an unpopular and a dangerous duty, and to conceal them by his euphemism of "introducing *elasticity* into the relations between the borrowing purchaser and the lending exchequer." This sort of elasticity has been the ruin of the Irish tenant.

This unsatisfactory nature of his only substantial security has set Mr. Balfour industriously to hunt for all manner of devices which look substantial, but are in fact shadows. For instance, one of the devices of the bill is a provision that the buyer shall for the first five years pay an annuity equal to 80 per cent. of the net value. The difference between this 80 per cent. and the normal annuity is called the purchaser's insurance money, and the fund accruing from it is to be drawn upon when the purchaser has fallen behind from no fault of his own. The objections to this expedient are manifold. In principle it is of very doubtful wisdom. I am not at all sure that the existence of this fund will not tend to weaken the responsibility of the borrower. It will tend to make him too ready to plead any slight accident as a reason

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

why the state should fall back on the insurance money, which, after all, has come out of his own pocket. Again, the first five years will be a critical time for the tenant who buys his holding in order to get a reduction of his old rent. He ought to have as favorable and unembarrassed a start as possible; and this he will not have if he is compelled to pay more, and it may be considerably more, than the annual annuity, merely to enable Mr. Balfour to make a better show of securities to the British taxpayer.

There is a still stronger and more direct objection. It can escape nobody who looks closely into the bill that by the device we are now considering the annuity will for five years be based on a twenty years' purchase scale. For five years the tenant who has bought at twelve or fifteen years' purchase will pay the same instalment as if he had bought at twenty years.* Why should a buyer pay for five years as if he had bought at twenty times the rent, when the landlord is willing to sell at twelve or fifteen times? Let us see what will happen. In the north, where sales will not be much under twenty years' purchase, the insurance provision will be nugatory. Where the price is eighteen years, it will be of trivial application. But where, as in the west, the price is twelve or fifteen years, its application will be so serious as to be almost prohibitory of sales. In the west, where reductions of 20 per cent. are not infrequently given even on judicial rents, it has been hard to induce tenants to buy even at fifteen years' purchase. Then how can you expect them to buy on condition of paying a twenty years' purchase rate for five years? The Irish tenant looks for an immediate result, and this in such circumstances as I have described he will not attain. What will be the effect? That exactly in those less prosperous districts which the bill is supposed especially to assist this disadvantage will weigh most heavily, and they will derive no relief under a system which in fact compels buyers to pay for a term of years a sum beyond, and substantially beyond, the market value of the land.

*NOTE.—Take a holding of £20 net annual value.

(*a*) *Price at twenty years' purchase*	£400
Normal annuity	16
(*b*) *Price at fifteen years' purchase*	300
Normal annuity	12
Eighty per cent. of net value	16

Therefore, the man who buys at fifteen years will for five years pay the same as the man who buys at twenty.—Q. E. D.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Before proceeding to what I may call the organic defects in the structure of his land policy, there is a point in Mr. Balfour's article which ought to be noticed in passing. One of the arguments against the bill is that, so long as a Coercion Act prevents combination among the tenants, the landlord is able, by means of outstanding arrears, to compel purchase and to screw up the price. Mr. Balfour meets this argument cavalierly enough. "In truth, to any one who knows the condition of Ireland during the last ten years there is an absurdity far beyond the necessity for formal refutation in supposing that the tenants are at any disadvantage in making bargains with their landlords." Only a few weeks ago a transaction was brought under the notice of a Parliamentary committee which helps us to test this alleged "absurdity." One of the London companies a year or two ago desired to sell. The tenants were heavily in arrear. They were told that they must either pay off the arrear (which was impossible), or submit to eviction (which was horrible), or else sign contracts of purchase at such and such a price. The Land Commission sent over an officer to examine whether the security was good for an advance. That officer reported that the contracts for purchase appeared to him "to have been entered into by the tenants under duress and intimidation of the most pronounced character," and the commissioners refused to sanction the transaction on this ground.* Yet Mr. Balfour sees nothing but absurdity in the supposition that a tenant is ever at a disadvantage in making a bargain with his landlord. The absurdity lies in supposing that the case above cited, where the tenant was asked to make his bargain with writ, sheriff, and battering-ram all at hand, is isolated and accidental.

Let us assume that Mr. Balfour's statement of the case for a scheme of purchase rests on firm ground, and that it is indispensable to substitute single ownership for a state of things in which neither landord nor tenant is owner. Let us assume, also, that the money must be advanced on British credit. The practical question remains, how this operation can be most safely performed. You may establish the direct relation of debtor and creditor on a large scale between the Irish occupier and the Brit-

* Evidence before Select Committee on the Irish Society and London Companies (Irish Estates). Appendix: Mr. O'Brien's Report and the Judgment of Mr. Commissioner Lynch for the defence of the company. See Q. 6,076-6,098.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ish exchequer. Or else you may interpose a central Irish authority as creditor, with a direct interest in enforcing payment of the instalments. It seems almost incredible that statesmen should hesitate in choosing between these two alternatives, or that they should fail to see that the first of them, by converting the British treasury into the Irish landlord, dealing with the individual tenant, and using eviction as the last resort, must constitute, in the present state of relations between the two countries, a grave public danger. Yet this incredible plan is the plan of Mr. Balfour's bill.

Two fundamental principles were contained in the Land Bill of 1886. The first was that only an Irish authority can enforce the remedies that are essential to secure the advance. On this head I have already said as much as there is room for. The second principle was that the only means of making sure that an Irish authority will insist on punctual payments is to give that authority a direct interest in them. This direct interest was conferred on the Irish authority in the proposals of 1886 to the tune of 18 per cent. on every transaction. The buyer was to pay, and the Irish exchequer was to receive, on the capitalized value of the gross rent; but the Irish exchequer, on the other hand, was to pay to the landlord, or repay to the imperial exchequer, on the net; and was to pocket the difference between net and gross. If the whole of the transactions had gone forward, it was calculated that the sum becoming subject to the discretion of the Irish authority would be something like £400,000 a year. This was a boon to the Irish taxpayers at large, derivable from resort to British credit; and nobody can deny that it was a boon which would have made it well worth while for the Irish authority to insist on the faithful discharge of obligations of a character so profitable to itself.

Time has ripened the doubt in the minds of some of those who were responsible for the proposals of 1886 whether it would not have been wiser to carry this principle still further by leaving an annual payment due from the tenant to the state in perpetuity, and so reserving for the Irish state a perpetual advantage from the present use of imperial credit. That is to say, the Irish state would become the landlord, and the tenant would acquire his holding subject to a perpetual rent of not less than 4 per cent. on the purchase money. The question was considered at the time. For a great scheme of that kind there is much to be said, but I need not discuss it here. For Mr. Balfour, with an almost unaccounta-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ble indifference, has omitted, both in his bill and his defence of it, any mention of this fruitful principle that the advantages of resort on so great a scale to imperial credit should not be exclusively confined to a certain section of the tenant farmers of to-day, but should be distributed among the whole body of Irish taxpayers for all time. It is needless to point out how such a process as this would lighten the task and smooth the way of an Irish government; or how it would undoubtedly constitute no inconsiderable compensation for the past misgovernment of Ireland by England.*

It is not necessary to add many words as to the plan for dealing with the congested districts. Mr. Balfour believes that he has devised a "method by which the pressure of population upon the means of subsistance should be lessened, partly by diminishing the former, partly by augmenting the latter." The foundation of this method is emigration, *plus* seed potatoes and an inquiry into the fishing resources off the west coast. As if the pigeon-holes of the Irish Office were not crammed with reports upon fish and stories of seed potatoes. Nor is emigration exactly a new remedy for Irish trouble. Yet, according to an official inquiry made some four years ago, the emigration which has taken place within the last twenty years has done nothing towards decreasing the population and consolidating holdings. Nobody can really expect the new Congested-Districts Board to make any mark on this part of the Irish problem, so long as it is distrusted alike by the clergy, the Nationalist leaders, and the people. As the organ of the landlords has warned the creator of this Board, "it is a very elaborate piece of machinery, but as there is no coal in the furnace or water in the boiler, the engine cannot be expected to do much work."

JOHN MORLEY.

* It may be worth while to illustrate in figures the value to an Irish government of this system under British and Irish credit respectively.

If the judicial rent of a holding is £100 and the net annual value £80, then the capitalized value at twenty years is £1,600. At 3⅛ interest and ⅞ sinking-fund, the annual payment by the Irish to the British exchequer equals £64. As the purchaser is to pay £80, the transaction will leave the Irish exchequer with £16 to the good.

Suppose British credit not to be available, and suppose that the Irish government could borrow, as some good city authorities expect, at 3½: this would make the annual payment in the above instance £68 5s. 0d., instead £64, leaving the Irish government with £11 15s. 0d. to the good.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE FIRST OF OCTOBER IN GERMANY.

THE approach of the first of October and the time when the law expires which has prevented all open discussion or writing on Socialistic subjects since 1878 is causing some interesting discussion in Germany. Socialists begin to realize that they have a definite place in the politics of the empire, and that with the expiration of the law they will be able to proceed on a definite principle, publicly, in the Reichstag and among the people, with journalistic organs to express their views, and a strong party behind them.

The events since 1878 have been a history that was predicted on all sides—a steady growth under the oppression; a steady increase of membership when the penalty for belonging to such a sect was exile. Prince Bismarck, in his contest with the Ultramontane party, had joined himself with the Liberals and the laboring classes in the years preceding 1878. He had encouraged the Social Democracy in many ways, and been their champion as far as his service to the Hohenzollerns would allow. He had even gained his idea of suffrage from Lassalle, it is said. Under this patronage, and with the general advance in ideas, the small sect grew to such magnitude that the Chancellor saw the necesssity of checking its growing influence. And it was in the midst of this that Germany was startled by the two attempts on the life of the old Emperor in the spring of 1878. A cry at once arose from all quarters against the Socialists. It was in vain that Herr Bebel, the leader of the Social Democracy, stated at once that neither he nor his party had anything in common with Hödel or Nobiling. The almost successful attempts at regicide had been attributed to the Socialists, and the feeling against the party could not be changed. The chance was too good a one for Bismarck to miss, and almost immediately a bill was proposed in the Reichstag for the suppression of the Socialist movement.

There were at the time 60,000 Socialists in Berlin, and about half a million in the empire. Their principles were being spread abroad by upwards of thirty five periodicals and a large number of organizations; and in the Reichstag six members, with Herr Bebel at their head, called themselves the representatives of the party.

The first draft of the bill called forth not only the censure of the Liberals in Germany, but that of all the leading journals in England, France, and the United States. It proposed to suppress all writing, reading, or lecturing on Socialist matters in the empire, and left the decision as to what "Socialist matters" were to the local authorities. The Liberals at once saw that much of their own writing might be suppressed under the act, and they separated from the Chancellor.

At the third reading, however, a somewhat modified, but still a stringent, law was passed on the 21st of October, to run three years, and on the next day the president of police in Berlin broke up four prominent organizations, and suppressed thirty-five periodicals and irregularly-issued pamphlets. One of these, the *Freie-presse*, appeared again the next day under the name of the *Tagespost*, but never reached a second number.

The same vigorous treatment took place throughout the empire, and Socialism for the time was under cover, and "must now propagate itself, as slanders do, in whispers; and, as usual, whispers will circulate more rapidly than any paper." The history of the last twelve years has shown that this was a prophecy. The party was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the moment crushed. All those who had been of it for other reasons than a deep belief in the doctrines of Socialism fell away like leaves from the trees in autumn; but the small nucleus grew stronger under oppression. The seats in the Reichstag remained about the same; and time passed till May 31, 1881. Then came a renewal under the same conditions, and the same thing was repeated in 1884 and 1887.

At the opening of the session last October the government brought forward another bill to renew the old one as before. Again came the attempt to strike out the clause limiting it to a term of years. But the *Kartel* party had something more to contend with than they had had before.

During these years since 1881 the Social Democrats had grown from something under half a million to over a million; the six members in the Reichstag had increased to eleven; not being able to publish pamphlets within the empire, publishing houses had been established in Zurich and Geneva and the papers circulated through Germany in a way that has been and still is astounding for its rapidity and efficacy. In fact, the few discoveries that have been made go far to show that a regular system for distributing pamphlets has been organized, which neither the local authorities nor the government have been able to bring to the light. So that with an increased standing and confidence, which these facts substantiate, the little party opened the session with a renewed opposition that succeeded eventually in carrying its point.

The discussion continued through the short session, and with the division of the parties on the question of the permanency of the law the Socialists found frequent opportunity to gain the ear of the Chamber and to push forward their objections to any such bill at all. Finally, at the third reading the bill was lost, and in the last days of February the Socialists knew that on the first day of October they were going back to the original *status* of 1878, but with a party larger, stronger, and more systematized than they had supposed possible then. Preparations are now being made for the coming day, and the enormous meetings that have been held during the summer—one rising to the number of 7,000—have in the last month grown too strong for the authorities to check. The leaders have been laying down platforms to hold the party together in a consistent whole, and these comprise the principles as stated twelve years ago—public education, regulation of the hours of labor, self-government, absolute freedom of the press, and the adjustment of the relations of labor and capital.

Thus under the leadership of Bebel and Liebknecht, and in spite of some dissensions, they stand over a million strong, with thirty-six members in the Reichstag, and a better organization than any of the other parties.

In the light of these events the policy of the young Emperor William toward Socialism is one of the most remarkable of his many remarkable steps. He has distinctly recognized the party; he has even invited one of them to drink beer with him at his castle; and his speeches in regard to the movement have led him into a course from which there is no turning back. This, added to their own activity, has made the Socialists to-day a recognized party in German politics, with a definite policy before them. On the first of October—or the seventh, to be more exact—meetings are to be held in different districts to build up the party more strongly, and arrangements seem to have been already made for the issue of party organs. The freedom will not be such as it is in America, but for the Germany of the last decade it is a great step toward absolute freedom of speech.

The questions that will soon come before the country are : How far is this to be allowed to go? and, Will the Socialist party run itself out, simply because of its new power to do whatever it sees fit to do, or will it grow stronger and gain an influential place in the Reichstag?—questions too difficult for any one to answer at present. The party has increased while under the vigorous law, not only in membership, but in moral strength. In these ten years labor troubles and the milder forms of Socialism have gained strength in Europe and America, until now half the writing in the more serious periodicals—whether daily, weekly, or monthly—is in connection with these subjects. These are the paramount questions of the last decade of the nineteenth century; and, in spite of what may be said to the contrary, they are gaining strength in the minds of the people at large.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the midst of this the Emperor of the most "paternal" government in Europe —if we except Russia,—is taking this huge, unformed subject into his own hands. He has ended the "blood-and-iron" rule; he has said again and again that he "will make the man great who will aid him in his endeavor to find the just course and keep to it, and will crush him who opposes him"; and his government has found it wise to take off what restriction has been in the past put upon the discussion of the subject. There can be no doubt of the young Emperor's earnestness; and yet one of the greatest principles of the Social Democracy in Germany to-day is *self-government*. That is, a monarchy of the old style goes hand in hand with a party working for government by the people!

It is a peculiar situation, that must have some sort of settlement before many years have gone—that has no exit behind. Is it an attempt on the part of the imperial government to get control of the whole organization in order to regulate the movement by-and-by by seeming to favor it now? or is it only to delay matters until a European crisis is tided over? Time must answer.

J. H. SEARS.

II.

POLICE OUTRAGES IN NEW YORK.

THE police force of the city of New York has gained an enviable reputation for bravery, and when its members are called upon to act in great emergencies, they have never failed to justify this reputation. At times there occur also individual proofs of devotion to duty in moments of great peril. Perhaps it is all the more on this account that the exhibitions of cowardice and brutality which are too frequently made by individual members of the force shock the community so severely. Within the past six months several cases of extreme brutality and despicable cowardice have been brought to public attention, and in each instance the policeman has suffered no greater punishment than a trial on charges before the Police Board.

Every one of these cases was a most heinous exhibition of cowardice, because the policeman in each instance relied upon his uniform, his shield, his club, and his personal influence with his superiors to protect him from the consequences of his brutality and cowardice. When an officer in uniform relies upon his badges of authority so that he feels safe in beating citizens or in wounding them with insulting language and brutal actions, such an officer is not only a coward, but is unworthy to serve with a body of men who are accounted brave. A few cases illustrative of this unworthy conduct may be cited.

A policeman in one of the uptown precincts was approached some weeks ago by a young woman who besought him to repair a great injury which he had done her. She came to him, not seeking a policeman to protect her, but a man to set right a wrong he had committed. He seized her violently and even used his club upon her arm, and then dragged her to a station-house and complained of her as one who had been guilty of disorderly conduct. The court discharged the woman, and charges were preferred against the policeman. A brief hearing was had, and that seems to have been the end of the case. Yet the honor of every citizen in this community was involved in these charges, and the Board of Police Commissioners should have left no stone unturned that they might discover whether it were possible that a woman pleading with a man to save her honor was liable to receive as a reply blows from a policeman's club and arrest and imprisonment on a charge of disorderly conduct.

A policeman, spying two men in the early evening who were walking one of the streets and carrying a bundle between them, stopped them and seized the bundle, and when one of the men protested against the insolence of the officer's manner, the policeman arrested both of them. They were committed to a cell for the night, dragged before a police court in the morning, and, after a brief examination and investigation, were shown beyond question to be honest men. They were discharged, and the officer was reprimanded by the court. These men were most cruelly outraged, and yet the officer who had done this has not even been called to account by the Police Board.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A passenger on one of the Staten Island ferry-boats was assaulted by a loafer. When the boat landed at the ferry slip the injured man called upon an officer to arrest his assailant. The man's face was proof sufficient of the severity of the assault. It was cut and bleeding from blows. Witnesses said that the officer to whom the injured man appealed first insulted the suffering man with brutal words, and then punched him in the back with his club. These witnesses, being indignant, expostulated with the officer, only to be insulted themselves. They went to a police station to complain of the officer, and a few moments later he himself appeared, dragging with him the poor fellow whose only crime was that he had appealed to the police for protection. The next day this unfortunate victim was discharged by the court, and the policeman was summoned before the commissioners, and that is all the punishment he has ever had.

Some time ago a gentleman was entertaining two or three friends at his house, when a policeman suddenly appeared, seeking, he said, for a thief. The head of the house demanded the officer's warrant, and as none was shown the policeman was instantly ordered out of the house. Instead of going, he went to the window, broke it open, and appealed to those who were passing to come and assist him. In this way he secured aid enough to arrest the gentleman and his friends. They were locked up and humiliated by being compelled to appear in a police court the next morning. The commissioners would not even entertain a complaint against the officer who made the arrest.

An old gentleman, feeling giddy from a sudden attack of vertigo, appealed to an officer to get him a cab and send him to his home. He was a most reputable business man, and his appearance should have suggested that he was suffering from sudden illness. The officer, however, insulted him by declaring that he was drunk, dragged him with great violence to a police station, and left him in a cell. The next morning the invalid was found unconscious, and he died within a few hours. This officer was not even reprimanded.

Two gentlemen walking on upper Broadway chanced to meet a friend whom they had not seen for a long time, and stopped to shake hands with him. A moment later an officer, with great insolence of manner, came up and pushed the gentlemen violently along, saying: "Here, get a move on you." The gentlemen protested against this violence, when the officer raised his club and was about to arrest them. They were spared that ignominy, however, by the captain of the precinct, who had seen the whole occurrence. He said to the officer: "Go on your beat, sir; I know these men, and it is impossible that they should have committed any disturbance." The captain said that the officer was a good policeman in times of danger, but that he had no judgment.

These examples are selected at random from a very long list of indignities. The records of the Police Commissioners show that within a few years hundreds of complaints have been made by reputable citizens, who have felt that their persons and self-respect have been most shamefully abused by policemen. So many of these cases appear that it is apparent that, in spite of some great excellences, the force must carry the odium of containing many men who are capable of cowardice, insolence, and brutality. What is the reason that such abuses are of frequent occurrence? Clearly because some fault exists in the system by which the policemen are governed. If there be such fault, it lies with the board which controls the force.

This board has been nominally non-partisan for many years. When Thomas C. Acton was its president, nearly thirty years ago, he forbade, through a resolution adopted by the board, all persons connected with the department, from the commissioners down, from being members of any political club. Nominally this resolution was in force for some years. But the commissioners themselves were the first to break it through the creation of personal organizations called by their names, which were said to be non-partisan, but which were not. The demoralization growing out of these organizations was very great. A man desiring to get upon the police force had only to become an active member of the organization and establish himself as a favorite with the commissioner who controlled it. Then, having secured appointment, it was easy to retain favor, although nominally no longer a member of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the organization. In some districts a policeman's influence with voters can be made very great, and that, of course, creates what in the colloquialism of the force is called a "pull" with the commissioners. It is the men who have "pulls" who are the most likely to be insolent, cowardly, and brutal.

The fault, then, lies in the partisanship which controls the policemen, and which is all the more dangerous because the board is thought to be non-partisan. The remedy lies with the Police Board itself. There should be first an end put to any possible relations between the board and the members of the force except those of superior and subordinate. The board should then make every member of the force feel that any deviation from the right use of his power and responsibility is sure to be followed by swift and sufficient punishment. Next, any officer who has done that which justifies the infliction of severe punishment, such as suspension or dismissal, should be sent for trial, also, to some criminal tribunal, that he may be punished by the courts, as any other citizen would be, for misdemeanor. If the commissioners, having found a man guilty of misdemeanor, had the power not only to dismiss him, but to instruct the superintendent to make charges against him before a court of justice, that he might be punished penally, then some sufficient sense of restraint would be found to operate against the unlawful display of passion and malice by policemen.

E. J. EDWARDS.

III.

ARE WOMEN MANNERLESS?

THE rapid generalizer is apt to rush to unsound conclusions. I think that a writer in the last number of THE REVIEW deduces his designation of women as "The Mannerless Sex" from a number of examples quite too limited.

While recognizing the truth of much that he says as to the rudeness of women in public places, I attribute almost wholly to men the responsibility for such bad manners as he instances. If women are "pushing" in banks and post-offices and street-cars, it is the men whose silly encouragement has made them so; and to prove this it is only necessary to mention the fact that it is exclusively *American* women that are under discussion: against European women no such charges of rudeness are ever made.

The question here arises whether American men cannot learn some valuable lessons from their trans-Atlantic brethren. In no railroad car in Europe, and in no street-car or omnibus, do men ever get up to give their seats to women; and the result is that every railroad company puts on cars enough to accomodate travellers, and then laws are passed providing that after all the seats are occupied no more passengers shall be admitted. So there are no standing passengers anywhere, and everybody who pays for a ride obtains a seat.

It seems to me that this method is much better than ours. And our railroads can be compelled to put on rolling stock adequate to the demands of the travelling public only by a persistent and concurrent refusal of men to surrender their seats to women. Such a refusal would be plainly just. Why should a man who has paid $2 for a seat in a railroad car relinquish it to a woman any more than a man in the orchestra of a theatre should resign his $2 seat? Indeed, why should a man who has paid five cents for a street-car seat relinquish it to a woman merely because the company has sold her a seat for five cents and cannot deliver the thing sold? And why should women accept such privileges as if a matter of right? No refined woman would accept a postage-stamp from a stranger without paying him for it: why should she accept what has cost him more than twice as much? Plainly because men have set the fashion of surrendering their seats under the plea of gallantry.

I might pause here to show that the words "gallantry," "politeness," "courtesy," etc., are meant to apply only to acts of deference which involve no financial loss, and do not properly include the transfer of things which have been paid for; but space will not permit such a digression.

A surrender of purchased seats and rights to elderly women or to women obviously ill would be bad enough; but the American method has come to include an indefinite extension of this habit which is pernicious in the extreme. If under the mercenary limitation of street-cars men continue to give seats to women who are ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parently unable to stand, what shall be said in defence of the preposterous practice of yielding seats to young women? Women are not responsible for it; I have repeatedly seen them politely refuse to take the proffered seat, and have seen old men overcome their scruples by indecent importunity which no woman could resist without making a scene. The fashion which prevails in such cities as Washington, Baltimore, and Southern towns generally, commanding that no man shall sit while any woman is standing,—without regard to the age of either party,—was born of the prurient egotism and vanity of men, and has no justification in either equity or courtesy. But foolish men have set the fashion, and if women are spoiled by it, the authors are responsible for the damage.

So of elevators. Why on earth should a man remove his hat in an elevator—unless, indeed, it is a part of a hotel parlor? The absurd habit prevails in Washington and Baltimore, and in provincial cities of the South and West; but it has no existence in the older cities of the North, any more than it has among well-bred people in Paris, London, or Berlin.

As to the alleged (and conceded) rudeness of women in business places,—at post-offices, at theatres, at banks, etc.,—it may be said that it originated in the mistaken concessions of men, who did not pause to consider that the gratification of their own vanity was at the expense of others, involving the discomfort of the whole travelling and commercial race of man. It is not too late to correct it.

W. A. CROFFUT.

IV.

ASSESSMENT LIFE INSURANCE.

A POLICY of life insurance is a contract agreeing to pay a certain sum upon the death of a specified person, provided death occur within a specified period. In practice the business is carried on by aggregations of policy-holders called "companies," and the guarantee of the sum assured rests upon the obligation of the mass of policy-holders to contribute for death-claims the equivalent of the aggregate amounts which the company is obligated to pay to the individual policy-holders. In addition to this the policy-holders must pay the cost of transacting the business.

These propositions are true of life insurance regardless of method, and unless there is equivalence between the risk assumed by the company and the liability assumed by the policy-holder, there can be no such thing as security.

When one has to deal with the liquidation of the obligation of the individual to the company and the security for deferred payments from the former to the latter, difference of method is developed, and this, in common parlance, is dignified into difference in system, whereas in reality there is but one system, and that the system of life insurance.

There have thus come to be recognized two "systems"—the "level-premium" and the "assessment." The first essential difference is that, while the "level-premium" company limits the liability of the policy-holder to a predetermined sum, the "assessment" company limits it only by his *pro rata* of the actual claims. Each recognizes the standard mortality tables, but one uses them to determine in advance a maximum rate of premium for each age, while the other uses them as a standard for adjusting losses incurred among the policy-holders of different attained ages. The equation of liability in the case of the level-premium company is, therefore, between the present value of the amount of the insurance and the present value of the premiums which the policy-holder is obligated to pay, it being assumed, for the purpose of calculating these present values, that the deaths will occur in accordance with a certain table of mortality and that invested funds will earn a certain rate of interest. As the payment of the sums insured depends wholly upon the realization of enough from the policy-holders to meet them as they fall due, and as the payments by the policy-holders are limited by contract, safety is possible only on a basis of assumption, as to mortality and interest, less favorable than the future will show; and as many of these contracts extend over a long term of years, allowance must be made for contingencies. Therefore one of two things is inevitable: either the liability of the policy-holder to the company must be excessive, or the security less than absolute.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The equation of liability in the case of the assessment company is between the cost which the risk will actually entail and the payment which the policy-holder must make, and is determinable as events develop and the payments are needed. This, however, does not imply that payments can be made by the policy-holder only as the money is needed for the liquidation of actual claims. On the contrary, there may be many variations in the method of making payments, provided the following essentials be kept in view:

(*a*) That funds contributed for the payment of death-claims be held inviolate for that purpose.

(*b*) That each policy-holder's contribution to the current claims of a given period be determined by the actual amount of such claims and his attained age, whether that contribution be made by him by direct payment or partly by direct payment and partly by diminution of his interest in any reserved fund that the company may hold.

(*c*) That each policy-holder receive the benefit of the payments actually made by him and the accretions thereon, and pay the cost of the entire benefits which he receives.

Since the limit of each policy-holder's liability in a given period is not a predetermined sum, the assessment company may take cognizance of the fact that all men who insure do not die insured—a fact that the level-premium company cannot take into account. In practice many assessment companies determine a payment which each policy-holder is to make at stated dates by discounting the sum assured by an assumed rate of interest and a table of the number that, from an initial number insured, will be living and insured at each succeeding age of life. This table is computed from the standard mortality tables, and from a table of discontinuances from other causes than death, made up from the tabulated experience of other insurance companies. This last element has a material effect in reducing the amount of the payment.

A payment thus determined is not to be confounded with the level premium of the other plan. It is not a limit of liability and, consequently, of security, but a deposit with the company of a sum on account of future death-cost, which is always available for and sacred to the payment of claims. The different aspect which it must hold in the eyes of the law from that of the "reserve" accumulation of the level-premium company is an additional distinction between the two methods. As the liability of the policy-holder in the level-premium company is absolutely limited by contract, any payment that he may make over and above the current death-cost is a diminution of the present value of the future contributions which he can be called upon to make. The present value of these contributions is, at the outset, the equivalent of the present value of the insurance granted, and if only the amount of current death-claims was paid by the policy-holder as time went on, these two present values would advance by equal steps. Therefore when anything more than this current cost is paid, the result is that the present value of the policy-holder's liability to the company is reduced below that of the company's obligation to the policy-holder, and unless the company holds the difference in hand in invested assets, it is and must be insolvent. The amount of these overpayments, together with the accretions thereon, is, therefore, available only for the payment of the claim under the individual policy to which it belongs, and if the company uses it for other purposes, even though it be the payment of other death-claims, it is insolvent and its insurance-granting power is destroyed; a receivership being the only alternative. It is because of this fact that failures have occurred in such numbers among companies operating on this plan.

In the case of overpayments to the assessment company no such liability exists. The money is received as a trust deposit made for a specific purpose—the payment of death-claims—and for that it is available. Its misuse renders the trustees criminally liable, but does not involve the destruction of the company's insurance-granting power. Thus in the level-premium company the impairment of the reserve fund means the loss to the policy-holder of the future insurance for which he has contracted, and this without returning to him the money that has been lost; in the assessment company, his future insurance is still secure, on the payment by him of its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cost, so that the loss of the money is not supplemented by the loss of what may be worth to him many times more.

Two corollaries follow from the distinction noted between the two plans:

(*a*) The cost of doing the business in an assessment company must be fixed by contract. This is the requirement of the law in all States that have legislated on the subject. Moneys that are collected for the purpose of paying death-claims must be held inviolate for that purpose, and though the policy that contributed them lapses and they are forfeited as a penalty, they are still available only for the purpose for which they were paid, and the persistent policy-holders must have the benefit of them in that direction.

(*b*) Savings in death-losses, surrender-charges on lapsed policies, gain in interest, and other profits in a level-premium company may be used for expenses or as the management determine. By the assumption on which the level premium is made up there is an excess over the requirements. The excess can be used for expenses. When the policy lapses, the liability under it is cancelled and the funds that were held to offset that liability are released, to be used as the management see fit. They are in no sense inviolate to the payment of claims or the benefit of the persistent policy-holders.

A large portion of the resources of every active life-insurance company must consist of the obligations of the policy-holders for payments on account of future death-claims, and this must especially be the case with an assessment company, which prosecutes its business without the accumulation of large sums of money. Upon the security of these resources rests the integrity of the contracts entered into. That security, under all plans, is the same—namely, such provision that the policy-holder who refuses to pay shall forfeit to the company more than the loss that he inflicts upon it. Theoretically, the lapse of a policy cancels an obligation to the company no greater than the obligation of the company to the policy-holder which is cancelled at the same time; but practically the matter of lapse is wholly in the hands of the policy-holder, who has it in his power to say whether the company shall be required to continue the contract that it has entered into with him, while the company has no election in the matter. Common-sense points to what experience attests—that lapse will occur when it is to the advantage of the member that it should, and that when a lapse would be to the advantage of the company, the policy will be kept in force. The company must, therefore, as an offset to the privilege granted the policy-holder, exact of him, in event of his lapse, a penalty sufficient to protect the persistent policy-holders against any loss that his act may cause. If it has always in hand the means of imposing this penalty, the security of that portion of the resources represented by the future payments of policy-holders is as secure under the one plan as under the other.

This statement of the principles underlying assessment life insurance is confined to the merest outlines. The plan is one that deals with pure life insurance—the protection of the family or the dependent against the loss that would be caused by the death of the father, the husband, or the provider. It shapes itself to many modifications; such, for instance, as creditor and partnership insurance. It furnishes, distinctively, insurance for the productive period of life, the period of the dependent family, the education of children, and the hazards of active business. It leaves the combination of insurance and investment, the seductive "tontine" and endowment, to the other plan. That its chosen and appropriate field is broad beyond even the need of a great business, the record that it has made proves.

Starting twenty years ago under the form of fraternal insurance, it has developed into a great business, recognized by the laws of almost every State as of equal legitimacy with its level-premium rival. It has formulated its methods, corrected its crudities, and to-day enrols in its list of policy-holders more than two and a half million citizens. During 1889 it paid over $42,000,000 in death-claims, swelling the total paid since organization, by the companies in active existence, to $300,000,000. That it has become the recognized plan of life, as distinct from investment, insurance, is attested by the fact that it paid more in death-claims in each of the last two years than did the level-premium companies. Thirteen millions of people in this country are interested directly in its present and future, while the whole people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have a common interest in the lessons of thrift which it teaches. It is far from necessarily antagonistic to the level-premium plan. Its true rivalry is to accomplish better than that plan can the work of life insurance. There is abundant room for both. As compared with the level-premium method, the assessment plan bases its claims upon the following propositions :

(*a*) Equal or greater security, without resort to excessive charges.

(*b*) Pure life insurance without the concomitant of vast accumulation, with the resultant dangers of poor investments and misuse of funds.

(*c*) A limited, as against an unlimited, expense charge.

(*d*) Funds paid for death-claim purposes held inviolate therefor.

(*e*) Equal security for that portion of the resources of the company which consists in the obligations of policy-holders to pay on account of future death-claims.

(*f*) Reserve funds available at all times as a conservator of the insurance-granting power of the company, rather than as a menace to that function.

(*g*) Equal accountability to the State for the proper conduct of affairs, and equal recognition under the law as life insurance.

GEORGE D. ELDRIDGE.

V.

SALVATIONISTS IN RETREAT.

IT IS now some ten or twelve years since the Salvation Army began operations in this country. The curiosity which at first followed the work has largely subsided, and the parades of the members, their songs and their exhortations, are no longer the object of ridicule or abuse. Public indifference seems to have overtaken these noisy, but in many instances earnest, people. The time is opportune, now that it is announced that a strenuous effort is to be made to excite renewed interest in the army's doings, to inquire as to the actual results of its ten years' campaign. How many converts can the army's officers point to as the fruits of their labors? How many outcasts have become respectable citizens, thanks to the army? How many pastors of churches are willing to say that the army has done valuable work in a field not affected by the usual church machinery? So far as I have been able to obtain answers to these questions, the results have been in inverse proportion to the noise made. I have found no pastor who says that he can count among his flock persons who might not have been there had the Salvation Army never existed. On the other hand, it will be admitted that such negative testimony is not altogether conclusive; the outcast, male or female, who escapes from the bondage of vice, crime, or abject poverty, is apt to hide the past and everything connected with it.

In 1883, when my acquaintance with the Salvation Army began, there were six "barracks," as the meeting-places of the army were called, in New York city and as many in Brooklyn. The present meetings are in strong contrast with those of that day. One friend of the order told me recently that the army was dying of respectability. Mr. Ballington Booth, a son of the founder of the order, and the chief of the American forces, is a quiet man as compared to some of the former leaders; there is less noise at the meetings, less laughter, less excitement, and, perhaps in consequence, a diminished attendance. Between a present meeting of a corps of the Salvation Army and an old-time Methodist revival there is no marked difference, either in the character of the talk or in the expression of feeling : if difference there is, it is wholly in favor of the Methodists.

Six or seven years ago it was another matter. For more than a year, when the army was beginning to work here, I followed the doings of a corps which met in Christopher Street. I went there once or twice a month and found the meetings interesting. Invariably the place was crowded, and, under the direction of an Englishman named Inman, the meetings were certainly full of life and noise, if of nothing else. At eight o'clock every night the corps rushed up the narrow stairs of the little building, followed by the throng attracted by the parade through the streets which preceded every meeting. The band, consisting of a cornet, fife, and bass-drum, played while the crowd found seats. The women members of the corps kept time upon tambourines, which were also vigorously thumped during the singing. Around the hall were hung placards bearing quotations from Scripture, or words of warning such as "Beware of the Flames to Come," or "It will be Hot-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter Hereafter," or "If You do not Repent To-Night, You will Probably Go to Hell." Upon wires running across the church from gallery to gallery were strung the trophies of the fight, such as gaudy ribbons, feathers, gewgaws, and even bonnets, which the women converts had discarded as full of vanity. The bad boys in the galleries sometimes twitched these wires so that the array of trophies bobbed up and down in time with the music. Loud laughter was one of the features of the meetings. I remember that one night an announcement to the effect that a person known in army circles as "Salvation Johnny," who played a cornet in the corps, had burst a blood-vessel on the previous evening and then lay in a precarious condition, was received with merriment.

Such things are no longer tolerated in the meetings of to-day, so far as I could judge from one held recently in Jane Street. No remarkable or alarming mottoes are in view, and no string of trophies is to be seen. Either the army has discarded the custom, or the young women converts have followed a famous light, who, feeling that gay ribbons were dragging her down to hell, "took them off and gave them to her sister." It was so quiet and decorous in the little hall into which I ventured upon seeing the sign "Salvation Army Meeting" upon a lamp at the door, that I could scarcely believe myself in a Salvation meeting. No wonder that worldly outsiders found the proceedings dull. I was particularly struck with the sing-song style of the remarks made by the soldiers who were called upon to testify to the wonders that salvation had done for them. It sounded as if they were reciting pieces learned by rote and of which they were heartily tired. I find in *The War-Cry*, the official organ of the order, which I bought at the door, so good a specimen of this testimony that I cannot do better than quote it here. With the army's usual fondness for alliteration, it is headed "Short Sermon by a Saved Soaker," and is accompanied by the information that "he was a well-known drunkard for nearly forty years, but now he beats a drum in the Salvation Army." The sermon is as follows:

"Dear Friends: It's just the same old story—Jesus and His love. Thank God, the Book says 'Whosoever will may come.' That means me and means you and every body else. If you want to be happy, be men and serve your proper master. Salvation pays, if it is only for this life. But I reckon it will be better still in the next. My workmates talk about me going back to the old style; but no, that will never happen while I trust Jesus to keep me. I tell them in spite of their jeers I'm saved. I know it and they know it too; it's a fact that they can't get over. Glory to God. I've tried both sides. This is the best. God bless every body. Amen."

The women especially were peculiarly weak and monotonous in what they had to say, and the captain of the meeting only rose to heights of earnestness when it came to the question of asking the audience to furnish money to go on with the work. Fully twenty minutes were given to pleading for pennies. An appeal for dollars was received with jeers.

"Have you all left your pocket-books at home?" he shouted. "Is there not a dollar bill left in this crowd?"

A bill floated down from the gallery, and was caught by the captain. "It's a counterfeit," said a voice. The captain examined it closely before he shouted "Hallelujah!" and went on with his begging. This mingling of business with religion is still as offensive as it used to be; which is also to be said of the frivolous manner in which ejaculations such as "Glory!" and "Hallelujah!" are shouted out on the slightest pretext. Young people will stop their personal gossip or quarrels to shout "Hallelujah!" without having the faintest notion of what is going on upon the platform. They shout because every one else shouts.

So far as may be judged by a casual visit, the hymns now used at the army meetings are those in use from the beginning of the movement here. Most of them contain pictures of the woes awaiting the unrepentant. One begins as follows:

"Oh, millions now in Hell are crying,
All is lost!
Amid eternal flames they're lying,
All is lost!"

Another of the same cheerful type:

"Your sparkling eyes and blooming cheeks
Must wither like the blasted rose;
The coffin, earth, and winding-sheet
Will soon your active limbs enclose."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of adaptations from well-known hymns there are a number, such as this parody upon Keble's noble verse :

"Hark ! Hark ! my soul, what warlike songs are swelling
Through all the streets and on from door to door;
How grand the truths those burning strains are telling
Of that great war till sin shall be no more.
Salvation Army, Army of God !
Onward to conquer the world with fire and blood."

The pains of hell and the necessity of counteracting the devil's wiles are harped upon *ad nauseam*, and this curious insistence upon the idea that the devil is wandering around, particularly among poor people, seeking whom he may devour, and that he is to be driven off chiefly by songs and shouting, the reckless use of sounding brass and tinkling cymbals, is still uppermost, apparently, in the theory upon which the leaders of the army work.

My visit having convinced me that the days of the Salvation Army in New York were numbered, I took the trouble to ask an intelligent man who had once been an active officer of a corps, but has now abandoned the army, what, in his opinion, had brought about this singular falling-off. "The work," said he, "is not a failure elsewhere. In some parts of the West and in Canada it is still fairly prosperous. Here in New York an attempt has been made to raise it to a higher level, to interest church people, to enlist the clergy; and just so far as it has been made acceptable to conservative people it has failed to attract the rabble. Another thing which helps the army outside of New York is that in country towns there are few or no cheap shows. In New York people can go to the theatre for ten cents, and they prefer the theatre to the meetings of the army. Ten years ago there were no dime performances such as we now have all over the town." In other words, the Salvation Army flourishes in places where its meetings are looked upon as circus performances to which no admission fee is charged.

As might have been foreseen when the Salvation Army showed signs of disintegration, several other organizations, modelled upon the army, have sprung up, officered by deserters from the original body. It is to be feared that these offshoots will be more extravagant in their doings than the Salvation Army. The few clergymen who are willing to say anything as to the moral effect upon the classes of the community affected by the Salvation Army, assert that no backslider is so hard to help as one who has been a Salvation-Army light and has grown tired. If this may be said of the soldiers of the Salvation Army, it follows that the doings of the seceding bodies, such as the Salvation Crusaders, will be still more hurtful. A clergyman to whom I suggested this possibility, remarked, however, that perhaps just in proportion to the extravagance of the meetings and methods would be the loss of interest in the movement. It has taken ten years for the Salvation Army to run its course in this neighborhood : the Salvation Crusaders may exhaust public patience in half that time.

PHILIP G. HUBERT, Jr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED